Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/socialismexposed0000revv

SOCIALISM

EXPOSED AND REFUTED.

BY

REV. VICTOR CATHREIN, S.J.

A Chapter from the Author's Moral Philosophy.

[From the German.]

ALMA COLLEGE
335
LIBRARY
C287
Alma, California

BY

REV. JAMES CONWAY, S.J.

SECOND EDITION.

WITH APPENDIX CONTAINING THE ENCYCLICALS OF POPE LEO XIII. ON THE CONDITION OF LABOR AND CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY.

NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO.
BENZIGER BROTHERS.
FOR SALE BY B. HERDER, ST. LOUIS.
1902.

Property of
CLgA
Please return to
Graduate Theological

Copyright, 1892, 1902, by Benziger Brothers.

PREFACE.

THE following pages form a chapter of the author's famous work on "Moral Philosophy." It was published separately in the original, and met with the most cordial reception. Not only were five large editions called for in less than two years, but translations were published in French, Italian, Spanish, Polish, and Flemish, which promise to rival the original in popularity. It has become a work of truly international fame.

The chief value of this little work is in the fact that it goes to the true sources of socialism, whether considered as a scientific economic theory or as a living social and political movement. There is nothing second-hand about it. The author did not shrink from the toil of examining the most voluminous and abstruse works as well as the ephemeral productions of the daily press and of socialistic oratory. Socialists themselves give him credit for having interpreted their meaning and their aims more faithfully and accurately than some of their own followers.

It is this accurate interpretation of the principles and policy of socialism that gives a universal and permanent value to Father Cathrein's treatise. So-

cialism is the same all the world over. It is the translation of German social democracy and its adaptation to the views of other civilized nations. It is the theory of Marx, Bebel, and Liebknecht in English, American, or some other foreign dress. The Germans have the very questionable merit of having given to modern socialism a systematic and scientific form. Whatever there is in our English and American socialistic life and literature is but an importation, a plagiarism, or bad imitation of German socialism. It is well, then, that a German, who has carefully examined the genuine article on its native soil, should become our guide in the study of this peculiar phenomenon of social and economic life.

The method of treatment will speak for itself. Forming a portion of a large scientific work, it is necessarily condensed; but it will be found, none the less, to contain all that is worth knowing to the general reader on the important subject of which it treats. Some questions—as, for instance, the scope and limits of civil power; the notion, origin, and lawfulness of property—have been omitted or only briefly touched upon, because they had been treated at full length in other parts of the work. Partly for this same reason, and partly because the author does not consider it as belonging to socialism strictly so called, which forms the subject of this treatise, nothing has been said of agrarian socialism, or the land question. For the rest, the author's masterly refutation of the land theories of Henry George and De Laveleye is before the English-reading public under the title of "The Champions of Agrarian Socialism" (Buffalo, N. Y., Peter Paul & Bro.).

The present translation was made from the fourth

German edition, but corrected and enlarged somewhat from the fifth edition. The editor, however, being left entirely free to use his discretion in getting out the English version, did not deem it desirable to adopt all the additions of the latest German edition, but only those that bear more directly upon recent developments in the socialistic movement (e.g., the Erfurt programme of 1891, p. 24, sq.). For the rest, he was careful not to omit anything which he deemed of importance for the full understanding of the principles and tactics of socialists.

He confidently trusts that his humble painstaking may at least to some extent help to arouse the English-speaking world to a sense of the grave dangers that threaten society, that they may the more eagerly grasp the right hand of safety held out to them in the recent Encyclical (*Rerum Novarum*) by our Holy Father Leo XIII.

WOODSTOCK COLLEGE,
August 31, 1892.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

SINCE the first publication of "Socialism" in English the original has gone through several editions and has been considerably enlarged. It has also been translated into several other languages, and is universally regarded as a classical work on the subject it treats. When, by the recent sad manifestations of Anarchism, new interest was awakened on the subject in this country, and a new edition of "Socialism," which was long since out of print, was called for, the translator was asked to revise and enlarge it according to the latest German edition.

However, the same reasons which induced him rather to reduce than to augment the bulk of the first edition prevailed, and he decided to make no addition to the text. He thought to confer a greater service on the reader by adding an appendix containing the Encyclicals of Leo XIII. on the "Condition of Labor" and on "Christian Democracy." Thus the book becomes a handy and comprehensive manual of the teaching of the Church on Socialism, as well as on its principles, aims, and history.

NEW YORK, March 1, 1902.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

PREFACE 1

CHAPTER I.

NATURE AND DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALISM.

Sec. I. Nature of Socialism. Its Relation to Communism 9

Sec. II. Development of Socialism 13

I. Socialism of Antiquity and of the Middle Ages 13

II. The Chief Founders of Modern Socialism 14

III. The Present Phase of Socialism . . 21

CHAPTER II.

UNTENABLENESS OF THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM.

Sec. I. Philosophical and Religious Assumptions . 35

I. Equal Rights of all Men . . . 35

II. Undue Emphasis of Industrial Life . 44

III. Materialistic View of Life . . . 46

Sec. II. Economic Principles 53

I. Socialistic Theory of Value . . . 53

II. The Iron Law of Wages 61

III. Liberalism the Root of the Evil . . 72

CHAPTER III.

SOCIALISM IMPRACTICABLE.

PAGE

Sec. I. State of the Question 79

Sec. II. The Organization of Labor 85
I. Socialization of Productive Goods . 85
II. Mode of Determining the Social Demand 88
III. Division of the Labor Forces . . 95
IV. Distribution of Labor. Vocations . 99
V. Some Unsatisfactory Solutions . . 102
VI. Refutation of an Objection . . . 109
VII. Impossibility of the Social Organization of Labor 111

Sec. III. Profit and Progress in Socialism . . . 114
I. Socialistic Dreams 114
II. Industry and Economy in Socialism . 116
III. Progress of the Socialistic State . . 121
IV. Arts and Sciences in Socialism . . 124

Sec. IV. The Division of Produce 130
I. Number of Persons as a Standard . 132
II. Labor-time as a Standard . . . 134
III. The Labor Performed as a Standard . 138
IV. Diligence as a Standard . . . 142
V. The Wants of Individuals as a Standard 143

PAGE

Sec. V. The Family in the Socialistic State . . 144
I. Marriage in the Socialistic State . . 144
II. Education and Instruction . . . 150

Sec. VI. Some Objections Answered 153
I. Communism in Religious Orders . . 153
II. Modern Industrial Organizations . . 155
III. The Modern Military System . . 157
IV. Stock Companies 158

CONCLUSION 160
APPENDIX 165

SOCIALISM.

CHAPTER I.

NATURE AND DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALISM.

SECTION I.

NATURE OF SOCIALISM. ITS RELATION TO COMMUNISM.

COMMUNISM has a wider signification than *socialism.* By *communism* in its wider sense we understand that system of economics which advocates the abolition of private property and the introduction of community of goods, at least as far as capital, or means of production, is concerned. *Communism* in this broad sense admits of various forms, the chief of which are the following:

1. *Negative communism* is restricted to the negation of private property. According to this form of communism all goods should equally be put at the disposal of all. This species of communism, to our knowledge, has never yet found a serious defender among philosophers; for it is evident that a system which does not exclude others from the use of those things which individuals have appropriated to themselves would ruin all industry and bring about a state of universal misery and utter disorder.

For who would till a field if others were permitted to come and reap the harvest?

2. *Extreme positive communism* advocates the transfer of all goods without exception to one great common administration. All production and the use of all goods should be common—common meals, common dormitories, common hospitals, etc. This system was advocated by some of the earlier communists.

3. *Moderate positive communism* (also called *anarchism*) advocates only the abolition of private property as far as capital, or the materials of labor, or productive goods in contradistinction to non-productive goods, is concerned. These goods should be handed over to the administration of independent but confederate communities, or federations of labor —not to the state. The founder and first leader of this anarchist party was the Russian Bakunin (died 1876).

In France the followers of the system of independent communities (*communes*) are called *communists* —not to be confounded with *communards*, or the members of the Commune of Paris in 1871—although not all of them advocate that property should be vested in the communes. The defenders of this system of communal property are also called *anarchists*, because they wish to exclude all central control of the state and vindicate political and economical independence to groups or unions of laborers. These communes or groups, again, should, in their mind, form a certain *alliance* somewhat resembling the ancient Grecian republics. These anarchists, however, are not to be confounded with those who reject all political and social authority in the community or state. This latter anarchism manifestly

cannot be constructed into any kind of political or scientific system.

4. *Socialistic communism*, or simply *socialism*, advocates the transformation of all capital, or means of labor, into the common property of society, or of the state, and the administration of the produce and the distribution of the proceeds by the state. Since modern socialists, and chiefly the followers of Karl Marx, have organized this system entirely upon a democratic basis, they call themselves *social democrats*, and their system *social democracy*. Social democracy may be defined as that system of political economy which advocates the inviolable ownership of all capital, or materials of labor, by the state, as also the public administration of all goods and the distribution of all produce by the democratic state.

We call socialism a *system of political economy*, not as if it did not also lead to many political and social changes, but because the gist of socialism consists in the nationalization of property and in the public administration and distribution of all goods. Socialism, at least as it is conceived by its modern defenders, is in the first instance an *economical system* and only secondarily and subordinately a political system affecting society, the state, the family, etc.

Socialism has been defined as the *political economy of the suffering classes*,[1] that is, "a philosophy which in its nature and in the sentiments of contemporaries is actually the economic philosophy of the suffering classes." But this definition, to say the very least, is inadequate; nay, we venture to say, incorrect; for it makes the nature of socialism dependent upon a certain subjective view of men.

[1] Schönberg's Handbuch der politischen Oekonomie, vol. I. p. 107.

Even though all the socialists of to-day could be convinced of the impracticability of their system and made to abandon it, yet socialism would still remain a system though it no longer existed in the consciousness of contemporaries. On the other hand, the ideal state determined by Plato is in truth socialistic, although his contemporaries considered his theory as an idle dream. Moreover, if such a definition were correct, the moderate economic system which is advocated by conservative politicians for the relief of the laborer and artisan would be socialistic, which we cannot grant to be the case.

From our definition it is evident that every socialist is a communist in the broader sense of the term; but not every communist is a socialist. It is also manifest that neither in communism generally nor in that special form of it which is called socialism is there any question of a general or of a periodical *distribution* of goods. Communism is the theoretical negation of private property, at least as far as capital, or labor materials, is concerned. It follows also that the so-called *agrarian socialists*, who deny only the right of private property in land, cannot simply be called socialists, although they defend many principles which would logically lead to the total abolition of private property. Nor can those politicians and theorists who in principle admit the right of private property, but in their economical systems put the administration of private property almost entirely into the hands of the state, be confounded with true socialists.

Section II.

DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALISM.

I. *Socialism of Antiquity and of the Middle Ages.*

From the most ancient times we meet with certain partially communistic systems and institutions. On the island of Crete we find a certain kind of communism introduced as early as 1300 B.C., which in later times Lycurgus took as his model for the constitution of Sparta. This constitution seems to have been Plato's ideal when he composed his work entitled "The Republic," as also, though in a more moderate form, in the work on "Laws;" for in these works he commends community of goods, community of education, and even community of meals. Aristotle,[1] who accurately describes these economic systems, has also clearly demonstrated their untenableness. While the communistic attempts of antiquity suppose a large portion of the population to be in the condition of slavery, there arose in the first Christian community in Jerusalem a higher kind of communism, based upon true charity and equality. Among the early Christians those who chose could retain their possessions; but most of them, of their own accord, sold all they possessed and gave the proceeds to the apostles for the common support of all.[2] In voluntary poverty the first Christians wished to devote themselves wholly to the service of God and of their neighbor. Such a condition, however, in its very nature, con-

[1] Polit. ii. 2. [2] Acts v.

sidering men as they generally are, could not be obligatory, universal, permanent—a circumstance which was overlooked by the Apostolics, Albigenses, Anabaptists, and other sects which in the course of centuries fell off from the Church and clung to the principle of the unlawfulness of private property. Apart from these heresies and from some communistic political works of fiction based, as it seems, chiefly on the "Utopia" of Blessed Thomas More, and the attempt of a communistic conspiracy under Babœuf (died 1796 A.D.), we may say that communism and socialism are essentially the growth of modern times. The reductions of Paraguay which are frequently set up as models of communism were not strictly communistic and were destined only to be institutions of a transitory character.[1]

II. *The Chief Founders of Modern Socialism.*

1. The occasion of modern socialism was the great development of industry and the modification of social circumstances dating from the latter part of the last century. Since the French Revolution modern discoveries have brought about astounding results in the field of industry and commerce. But one of these results was the great division of society into two hostile classes—a small number of wealthy capitalists, and an immense multitude of day-laborers—which classes are usually designated respectively as *capital* and *labor*. Modern socialism takes its origin from this opposition between the rich and the poor; and its last object is the final removal of this inequality.

[1] Stimmen aus Maria Laach, vol. xxxv. p. 445.

2. The first who endeavored to give a form to modern socialism was *Count de St. Simon* (1776–1825). From him dates socialism in its present shape. Liberal political economists had established the principle *that labor alone is the foundation and source of all value*, and, consequently, of all wealth. Socialism seized upon this principle and made it the basis of its operations against the modern conditions of property. St. Simon drew from this principle the conclusion that labor—industry in its wider sense—must be the standard of all social institutions; in other words, that the laborers should not as heretofore take the last but the first place in society; it was, therefore, the business of social science to restore the laborers to the position due to them.

St. Simon was only a theorist. He made no practical attempts to give effect to his views; nay, he did not even venture directly to question the right of private property. *Bazard*, his chief disciple, continued to build on the foundation laid by his master. In order to remove the inequality and seeming injustice of the existing conditions of property, he demanded a complete modification of the *rights of inheritance*. In place of kindred he would make *merit* the basis of inheritance; or rather, the state alone was to be the heir of all its children and distribute the property of the deceased among the most worthy of the living.

3. Almost contemporarily with St. Simon, *Charles Fourier* (1772–1837) proposed his system of socialism. Fourier proceeds from the supposition that what is ordinarily called the will of God is nothing else than the laws of universal attraction, which uphold the universe and manifest themselves in the

instincts and tendencies of all things. Also in man these instincts are revelations of the divine will. Therefore it is unlawful to suppress them; they should be gratified; from their gratification arises human happiness; but the means to this gratification is the *organization of labor.*

This organization is to be brought about in this wise. Proprietors, without losing the right of property, should contribute all their wealth to the common industry, in order that each individual in continued succession may be able to apply himself to that occupation to which his momentary instinct may incline him. Such labor would be a delight. Fourier, moreover, makes the following propositions. On every square mile should dwell two thousand persons (a *phalanx*) in one large building (*phalanstère*) under the control of an overseer (*unarque*). The phalanxes, again, should be divided into series, the series into groups. Thus each one might at pleasure change his labor. From the proceeds of the labor four-twelfths goes to the capital as interest; three-twelfths is given to genius; and the rest, five-twelfths, is given to labor. Yet neither St. Simon nor Fourier ventured to suggest the abolition of private property. For the rest, there is an intrinsic contradiction in the very fact that Fourier allows private property to exist and wishes to compel the proprietor to give all his capital for common use.

4. Like Bazard, so also *Louis Blanc* (1811–1882) finds the root of all economic evils in free competition; and the only remedy, according to him, is in the public organization of labor. The state should undertake the part of the chief producer and gradually extend its production so as to make private production impossible. After the state has achieved this result it should regulate and control the entire industry of the nation. Louis Blanc was also the first who publicly represented the principle of right to labor and endeavored to bring this right into ac-

tion by erecting national workshops for laborers out of work.

5. In Germany *Karl Rodbertus* (1805–1875) is considered the first representative and pioneer of "scientific" socialism. He develops his theories in popular letters and essays on social questions and political economy.[1] He himself characterizes his doctrine as the "logical development of the principle introduced into political science by Adam Smith, and further developed by Ricardo, *that all goods, considered from an industrial standpoint, are only the product of labor, and cost nothing but labor.*"

If the division of the national produce is left to itself, says Rodbertus, the wages of the laborer becomes an ever smaller portion of the national produce the more production increases: and this gives rise to pauperism and to industrial crises. These evils can be remedied only by the gradual introduction of society into a condition in which neither real estate nor capital can further exist, but only wages or labor income.

6. A much more important part, however, in the development of "scientific" socialism both in and outside of Germany was played by Karl Marx (born 1808 in Treves, died 1883 in London). He develops his theory principally in his famous work entitled "Capital." Like St. Simon and Rodbertus he proceeds from the principle that labor is the only source of *exchange-value*. He distinguishes between use-value and exchange-value. The former consists in the usefulness of an object for supplying human wants and is based upon the physical and chemical attributes of the object. The latter, on the other

[1] Sociale Briefe, 1850–51. Briefe und Socialpolitische Aufsätze, 1882.

hand, consists in the ratio in which the use-value of one object stands to the use-value of another. The use-value of bread, for instance, consists in its usefulness for nourishment; its exchange-value, on the other hand, consists in its fitness to be exchanged or sold for other goods or merchandise. An object has exchange-value only because it contains labor, and the measure of the labor embodied in it is the measure of its exchangeable value.

Hence Marx infers that by mere exchange of goods against goods no *surplus-value*, or increment, can be obtained, since in a case of exchange what is given must be equivalent to what is received. The same applies to exchange of capital, in which money is bartered for goods, and goods again for money. How does the capitalist notwithstanding come to his *surplus-value*, or increment, nay, to the accumulation of an enormous capital? It is by the secret of "*surplus-making*" (Plusmacherei), which Marx discloses to us, and the disclosure of which forms the gist of his work on "Capital." His line of reasoning is the following:

Like every other commodity, labor-power, which in our day is considered a species of merchandise, has its use-value and its exchange-value. The exchange-value of labor-power is determined, like the value of every other kind of merchandise, by the average amount of joint labor contained in it, or by the value of the nutriment which is generally required for the nourishment and sustenance of the labor-power. But besides this labor-power has a use-value of its very nature, "which costs the laborer nothing, but enriches the capitalist considerably." For labor has this property, that it confers upon its products greater exchange-value than it possesses itself. If, for instance, the value of the victuals which the laborer generally consumes is three shillings, those three shillings form the exchange-value of

the labor-power, or the wages, due to it. A portion of the labor-time, say six hours, is employed by the laborer to produce in another form that value which he receives under the form of money (three shillings). This portion of time Marx calls the necessary *labor-time.*

But the laborer must over and above this necessary time work perhaps twelve hours. "This second period of the labor process which the laborer works beyond his time costs him labor, expenditure of labor-power, but has for him no value. *It forms* SURPLUS-VALUE, *which smiles upon the capitalist with all the attractiveness of a new creation.*"[1] This surplus-value, or increment, the capitalist appropriates without cost. It naturally increases in proportion to the length of the daily labor-time, with the number of laborers employed, and the lowness of wages.

But in virtue of the very same laws by which capitalism oppresses and overreaches the laborer, capital itself must yield to a higher social order. The number of competitors is constantly diminished, while their power is becoming constantly more oppressive. On the other hand, the number of impoverished laborers is on the increase and their misery is becoming more unbearable. The concentration of labor-material, the organization of labor, and the education of the organized labor-classes approach a stage at which the bonds of capitalism and monopoly are to be rent in the hands of the few. The "spoilers shall be despoiled," and individual property will be restored "*based on the achievements of a capitalistic era,* i.e., *on the co-operation of free labor and common ownership in land, as well as in those means of production which are themselves the product of labor.*"[2]

The change of individual private property, based upon individual labor, into capital is naturally a process much more tedious, arduous, and difficult than the transfer of the capitalistic private property, as it now actually exists on the basis of social usurpation of all means of production, into public property. The former process consisted in the expropriation of the masses of the people by a few usurpers; the latter consists in the *expropriation of a few usurpers by the masses of the people.*

[1] Kapital, 4 ed., p. 178.
[2] Ibid., p. 728.

This passage is important, as it opens to us a view into the future socialistic order of society as it existed in the mind of the founder of the *International.* Taking this passage in connection with the other expositions of Marx in the work entitled "Capital," we may establish the following programme:

a. Common ownership of all means of production to be brought about by the expropriation of the usurpers (capitalists) by the masses of the people through democratic as opposed to constitutional ways and means.

b. Social or common employment of all means of labor by the co-operation of free labor—the public organization of labor on a democratic as opposed to a constitutional basis.

c. The proceeds of labor are to be regarded as public produce. Part of this produce is to be employed for new production; the rest is destined for use, should be distributed and become private property. This is the part of the produce which Marx repeatedly characterizes as private property based on labor.

d. In the distribution of the public produce, according to the principles of Marx (although he is not sufficiently explicit on the point), the amount of labor which is profitable for society, or the *necessary labor-time* which each one must expend for the benefit of society, is to be taken as a standard.

7. As an agitator *Ferdinand Lassalle* (1825–1864) has, at least in Germany, exercised a greater influence on the development of socialism than did Karl Marx; but in theory "the labor king" stands upon the same ground as the founder of the *International.* He closely follows Marx, particularly in his theory on value. Peculiar to the great agitator is that law which after him was called the "iron law of wages." The average wages should be equivalent to the amount necessary for the support of life—i.e., for

subsistence and propagation—according to the customs of a given country. This law, it is true, had been previously established; but Lassalle enunciated it in such terms as to give it point and make it suitable for agitating purposes. We shall submit the law of wages to further inquiry at a later stage of this work.

III. *The Present Phase of Socialism.*

If we now cast a glance on *the present phase of socialism* we may distinguish two principal schools: (1) The German *social democrats and the kindred collectivists in France and England*, and (2) the *anarchists*. The first school stands altogether on the ground of Marx's theory. The German social democrats, whose chief representatives are Franz Engels and the members of the Imperial Parliament Bebel, Liebknecht, Auer, Senger, and Grillenberger, adopted the following programme in Gotha in the year 1875—known as the Gotha programme—which they have since strictly followed, and which was considered the official platform of this school till October 1891, when a new platform was adopted at Erfurt, called the Erfurt programme. We print both programmes in full.

A. The Gotha Programme (1875).

I. Labor is the source of all wealth and culture; and since universally efficient labor is possible only through society, it follows that, the universal duty of labor being supposed, the entire product of labor belongs with equal right to the entire body of society,—that is, to its individual members,—each according to his individual wants.

In the present state of society labor materials are monopolized by capitalists; and the dependence of the laboring class thence arising is the cause of misery and slavery in all its forms.

The liberation of labor requires the transformation of all labor materials into the common property of society, and the social control of all labor, together with the application and just distribution of the entire proceeds of labor, for the use of all.

The liberation of labor must be the work of the laboring class, which stands in opposition to other classes as a reactive mass.

II. Proceeding from these principles, the socialistic labor party of Germany seeks by all means to bring about a free state and a socialistic organization, the abolition of the iron wage law and of the system of wage-working, the removal of oppression of every form, and of all social and political inequality.

The socialistic labor party of Germany, though operating within the confines of the nation, is conscious of the international character of the labor movement and is determined to discharge all the duties which this universality imposes upon the laborers to bring about the brotherhood of all men.

The socialistic party of Germany demands, in order to prepare the way for the solution of the social problem, the institution of socialistic industrial associations at the public expense under the democratic control of the laboring people. These associations are to be of such dimensions that from them the socialistic organization of the entire people may be developed.

This portion of the programme contains the economic aims and, consequently, the gist of the social democratic aspirations. It is followed by a second political programme which voices the political aims of the movement—in the first place, the final and permanent ends and, in the second place, the means which are gradually to transform our present society into a socialistic state.

The socialistic labor party of Germany demands that the constitution of the state should rest upon the following principles: (1) Universal, equal, and direct suffrage with private ballot, and obligatory voting of all subjects of the state from the age of twenty upwards for all elections in state and municipality. The election-day is to be on a Sunday or a holiday. (2) Immediate legislation by the people. Decisions regarding peace and war by the people. (3) Universal military service. Civil militia instead of standing armies. (4) The abolition of all exceptional legislation, especially regarding the freedom of the press, of association, and of holding public meetings, and generally of all laws which in any way restrict the free expression of opinion, free thought and research. (5) The administration of justice by the people. Free administration of justice. (6) Universal and equal education of the people by the state; universal compulsory education; free instruction in all educational institutions. Religion to be declared a private matter.

The socialistic labor party of Germany demands in the present existing social circumstances: (1) The greatest possible extent of political rights and franchises in conformity with the above demands. (2) One only progressive income-tax for state and municipality in the place of all existing taxation—particularly in the place of the indirect taxation which weighs so heavily upon the people. (3) Unlimited right of association. (4) A normal working day suited to social circumstances. [By a normal working day some socialists understand a maximum of working hours permitted in any given industry; others, again, understand by the normal working day the necessary social labor-time of an individual, which varies in proportion to his natural wants and to the productiveness of his labor; others, again, understand by the normal working day the number of hours which a laborer of medium health and strength and of medium effort, under ordinary conditions, can work daily.] Prohibition of Sunday labor. (5) Prohibition of child labor, and of such labor for women as is injurious to health and morality. (6) Laws protecting the life and health of the laborers. Sanitary control of the workmen's dwellings. The supervision of mines, factories, workshops, and domestic industries by

officers elected by the workmen. Efficient insurance and compensation laws. (7) The regulation of prison labor. (8) Independent administration of all aid and benefit funds.

B. The Erfurt Programme (1891).

I. The economical development of civil society necessarily leads to the destruction of small industries, the basis of which is private ownership of the laborer in the means of production. It divests the laborer of all means of production and transforms him into a penniless proletarian, while the means of production become the sole property of a comparatively small number of capitalists and real-estate owners.

Hand in hand with the monopoly of capital goes the abolition of the disorganized small industries by the formation of vast industrial organizations, the development of work-tools into machines, and a gigantic increase of the productiveness of human labor. But all the advantages of this change are monopolized by the capitalists and landowners. For the proletariat and the declining middle classes—common citizens and farmers—this social change is tantamount to the prevalence of insecurity of existence, misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, vexation.

The number of proletarians increases, the army of superfluous laborers assumes greater dimensions from day to day; the conflict between the oppressor and the oppressed is becoming more and more violent—that conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, which divides modern society into two hostile camps and is the common characteristic of all industrial nations.

The chasm between rich and poor is widened by those financial *crises* which are grounded in the very nature of capitalistic industry—crises which become ever more extensive and destructive, make universal insecurity the normal state of society, and give evidence that the productive forces of our age have become uncontrollable by society, and that private property in the means of production has become incompatible with their proper utilization and full development.

Private property in the means of production, which for-

merly was a means of securing to the producer the ownership of his produce, has nowadays become a means of dispossessing farmers, laborers, and small merchants, and of making the non-laborers—capitalists and landlords—the possessors of the produce of labor. Only the transformation of private capitalistic property in the means of production—i.e., land, mines and mining, raw material, tools, machinery, and means of communication—into common property, and the change of private production into socialistic—i.e., production for and through society—can effect that the extensive industry and the ever-increasing productiveness of social labor shall become for the downtrodden classes, instead of a fountain of misery and oppression, a source of the highest prosperity and of universal and harmonious perfection.

This social revolution implies the liberation, not only of the laboring class, but of the entire human race, which is suffering under our present condition. But this emancipation can only be the work of the laboring classes, since all other classes, notwithstanding their clashing interests, take their stand on the platform of private property in land and in the means of production, and make the preservation of modern society on its present basis their common object.

The struggle of labor against capitalistic oppression is necessarily a political one. The laboring class cannot carry on its industrial struggles and develop its economic organization without political rights. It cannot effect the transfer of the means of production into the possession of the body social without possessing itself of political power.

To give to this struggle of the laboring class spontaneous activity and unity, and to assign to it its natural direction—this is the end and aim of the social democratic party.

The interests of the laboring classes are the same in all countries where capitalistic industry exists. Owing to the extent of international commerce and industry the condition of labor in every country becomes more and more dependent on the condition of labor in all other countries. The emancipation of the laboring classes is therefore a work in which the laborers of all civilized countries should take part. In this conviction the social democratic party of

Germany feels and declares itself to be at one with the intelligent organized laborers of all other countries.

The social democratic party of Germany does not contend for new rights or privileges for the laboring classes, but for the abolition of the rule of the classes and of the classes themselves, and for the equal rights and equal duties of all without distinction of sex or pedigree. Proceeding from these views, social democracy in modern society opposes not only the enslavement and oppression of the laboring class, but every kind of slavery and oppression, no matter against what class, party, race, or sex they may be brought to bear.

II. Proceeding from these principles, the social democratic party of Germany for the present demands:

1. Universal, equal, direct suffrage by private ballot for all citizens over twenty years of age, without distinction of sex, in all elections and ballotings. Representation proportioned to the number of population, and meanwhile a redistribution of election districts after each census. Biennial elections. Elections and other ballotings to be held on a legal holiday. Compensation for representatives. Abolition of every restriction of political rights except in the case of legal disfranchisement.

2. Direct legislation by the people through the right of motion and of veto. Self-rule and self-administration by the people in empire, state, province, and community. Election of magistrates by the people; their responsibility in solidarity to the people. Annual grant of taxation.

3. Education for universal military service. Popular militia instead of standing armies. Decisions regarding peace and war by the representatives of the people. International disputes to be settled by arbitration.

4. Abolition of all laws which restrict or suppress freedom in the expression of opinion; the right of forming associations and holding conventions.

5. Abolition of all laws which subordinate woman to man in public and private life.

6. Religion is to be declared a private concern; the use of public funds for ecclesiastical and religious purposes to be abolished. Ecclesiastical and religious communities are to be regarded as private societies which are perfectly free to manage their own affairs.

7. Secularization of the schools. Compulsory attendance of the public schools. Instruction, use of all the means of instruction (books, etc.), and board free of charge in all public elementary schools, and in the higher institutions of learning for such pupils of both sexes as, on account of their talents, are judged fit for higher studies.

8. Gratuitous administration of justice and legal advice. Administration of justice by judges elected by the people. The right of appeal in criminal cases. Indemnification of those who have been unjustly accused, arrested, or condemned. Abolition of capital punishment.

9. Free medical attendance, also in childbirth; free medicine. Free burial.

10. Graded and progressive taxation on income and property to meet all public expenses which are to be defrayed by taxes. Obligatory self-valuation. Taxation on hereditary property, graded progressively according to the extent of the property and the degree of kindred of the heirs. Abolition of all indirect taxes, customs, and other economical imposts, which subordinate the general interests to the interests of the few.

For the *protection of the laboring class* the social democratic party of Germany demands for the present:

1. National and international legislation for the protection of labor on the following basis: (*a*) The determination of a normal work-day not exceeding eight hours. (*b*) Prohibition of industrial labor by children under the age of fourteen years. (*c*) Prohibition of night-work, except in those branches of industry which of their nature, for mechanical reasons or for the common welfare, require night-work. (*d*) An uninterrupted rest of at least thirty-six hours every week for each laborer. (*e*) Abolition of the force system.

2. Supervision of all industries. Investigation and regulation of the condition of labor in town and country by means of imperial and provincial labor bureaus and labor councils. An effectual system of industrial hygiene.

3. Equality between agricultural laborers or servants and industrial laborers; abolition of the domestic relations between masters (or mistresses) and servants.

4. Maintenance of the right of coalition.

5. Insurance of laborers to be regulated by the imperial

government, with due co-operation of the laborers in the administration.

A. Schäffle,[1] a socialistic writer of some prominence, gives, as the result of a long-continued study of socialistic literature, the following description of the ends and aims of socialism:

The conversion of *private* capital, i.e., of the speculative private system of production controlled by free competition into *collective* capital—i.e., into a system of production which by means of collective or common ownership of all means of production by all members of the community would bring about a united [social, collective] organization of the national labor. This collective method of production would supplant the present system of competition by putting the collective [social, co-operative] branches of production under professional control and by distributing, by means of this same professional direction, the entire social produce of all among all—according to the standard of the social value of the productive labor of each individual.

In the socialistic state, therefore, there would be, according to Schäffle's declarations, no private property in productive materials, consequently no private enterprise and no private competition. All labor materials would be the property of the state as such, or of all the members of the state taken collectively. The productions would be the result of the public productive labor of the community. "All socially regulated productive and industrial institutions fitted out from the collective capital of the state." There would be no more wage-working or wages. All laborers would be, as it were, in the pay of the community, which would give to each one his share of the proceeds in proportion to the part which he had taken in the entire labor. "The necessary amount of production of whatever kind must be determined by a continued official account kept by bureaus of consumption and production, and this estimate must determine the extent of the scheme of each branch of industry. Deficits and surpluses, which may occur in the actual proceeds

[1] Quintessenz des Socialismus, 9 ed., 1885, p. 2.

below or above the industrial estimates of each period must be balanced by means of supplies to be kept on hand—not in private stores, but in public magazines."[1]

This scheme exactly coincides with that laid down by Karl Marx in "Capital" and adopted in the Gotha and Erfurt programmes. The same scheme is reproduced in almost all social democratic publications. Thus, for instance, in a manifesto entitled "What the Social Democrats are and what they aim at," scattered broadcast for years among the laborers at the elections, we read among other things: "Down with the wage-system! This is the first demand of social democracy. In the place of wage-work, with its class ascendency, must be established social labor, association (co-operative production). The instruments of labor must cease to be the monopoly of one class and become the common property of all. . . . [We demand the] control of production and the division of the produce in the interest of the masses; abolition of modern commerce, which is fraud, as well as of the modern system of production. Co-ordinate with one another all workmen shall have to perform the necessary labor for the interests of all the members of the state. . . . Labor shall be a burden to none, because it is the duty of all. . . . And in order that this scheme may be realized we demand a democratic government—a government of all and for all, a government consisting of society itself rationally and justly organized, a universal institution for the insurance of happiness and culture, a brotherhood of free and equal men."

That the description which we have given of socialism is correct may be easily seen from the writings of August Bebel,[2] J. Stern,[3] and others, whose opinions exactly coincide with those which we have reproduced. Bebel, it is true, wishes only to give his personal views, but his great popularity with the masses of socialists is a sufficient guarantee that his opinions are orthodox in the socialistic sense. Since, however, in our criticism of socialism we shall have

[1] Quintessenz, p. 3.

[2] Unsere Ziele, 5 ed., 1875; Die Frau in der Gegenwart, 7 ed., 1887.

[3] Thesen über den Socialismus, 1890.

frequent occasion to return to Bebel, we shall here, in order to avoid repetitions, abstain from quoting his opinions.

In our description of socialism we have chiefly dwelt upon the tenets of the social democrats of Germany. However, the principles of all advanced socialists of other countries coincide in the main with these. We have only to compare, for instance, the platform adopted by the International Labor Congress of Paris, 1889, with the Gotha and Erfurt programmes, and with the various other documents which we have cited, to convince ourselves of the identity. The only difference between the socialists of the various nationalities is in their tactics, not in their principles; and in no other country have the principles been so scientifically developed as in Germany.

That the tendency of American socialism is the same as that of European nations may be seen by comparing the platform of the American Socialistic Labor Party with the various schemes already described. The congress held at Baltimore, 1883, issued the following manifesto:[1]

"Labor being the creator of all wealth and civilization, it rightfully follows that those who labor and create all wealth should enjoy the full result of their toil. Therefore we declare:

"That a just and equitable distribution of the fruits of labor is utterly impossible under the present system of society. This fact is abundantly illustrated by the deplorable condition of the working classes, which are in a state of destitution and degrading dependence in the midst of their own productions. While the hardest and most disagreeable work brings to the worker only the bare necessaries of life, others, who labor not, riot in labor's production. We furthermore declare:

"That the present industrial system of competition, based on rent, profit-taking, and interest, causes and intensifies this inequality, concentrating into the hands of a few all means of production, distribution, and the results of labor, thus creating gigantic monopolies, dangerous to the people's liberties; and we further declare:

"That these monster monopolies and these consequent

[1] Richard Ely, Labor Movement, pp. 269, 270.

extremes of wealth and poverty supported by class legislation are subversive of all democracy, injurious to the national interests, and destructive of truth and morality. This state of affairs, continued and upheld by the ruling political parties, is against the welfare of the people.

"To abolish this system, with a view to establish co-operative production, and to secure equitable distribution, *we demand that the resources of life, namely, land, the means of production, public transportation, and exchange, become as fast as practicable the property of the whole state.*"

More explicit still are succeeding declarations, as those issued in Cincinnati, 1885.

The Socialistic Labor Party strives for a radical revision of the Constitution and statutes of the United States, the States and municipalities, according to the following demands:

(*a*) Social Demands.

1. The United States shall take possession of the railroads, canals, telegraphs, telephones, and all other means of public transportation.

2. The municipalities to take possession of the local railroads, of ferries, and of the supply of light to streets and public places.

3. Public lands to be declared inalienable. They shall be leased according to fixed principles. Revocation of all grants of lands by the United States to corporations or individuals the conditions of which have not been complied with or which are otherwise illegal.

4. The United States to have the exclusive right to issue money.

5. Congressional legislation providing for the scientific management of forests and waterways, and prohibiting the waste of the natural resources of the country.

6. The United States to have the right of expropriation of running patents. New inventions to be free to all, but inventors to be remunerated by national rewards.

7. Legal provision that the rent of dwellings shall not exceed a certain percentage of the value of the buildings as taxed by the municipality.

8. Inauguration of public works in times of economical depression.

9. Progressive income-tax and tax on inheritances; but smaller incomes to be exempt.

10. Compulsory school education of all children under fourteen years of age. Instruction in all educational institutions to be gratuitous, and to be made accessible to all by public assistance (furnishing meals, clothes, books, etc.). All instruction to be under the direction of the United States, and to be organized on a uniform plan.

11. Repeal of all pauper, tramp, conspiracy, and temperance laws. Unabridged right of combination.

12. Official statistics concerning the condition of labor. Prohibition of the employment of children in the school age, and the employment of female labor in occupations detrimental to health or morality. Prohibition of the convict-labor contract system.

13. All wages to be paid in cash money. Equalization by law of women's wages with those of men where equal service is performed.

14. Laws for the protection of life and limb of working people, and an efficient employer's liability law.

15. Legal incorporation of trades-unions.

16. Reduction of the hours of labor in proportion to the progress of production; establishment by act of Congress of a legal work-day of not more than eight hours for all industrial workers, and corresponding provisions for all agricultural laborers.

(*b*) Political Demands.

1. Abolition of the Presidency, Vice-Presidency, and Senate of the United States. An Executive Board to be established whose members are to be elected, and may at any time be recalled, by the House of Representatives as the only legislative body. The States and municipalities to adopt corresponding amendments of their constitution and statutes.

2. Municipal self-government.

3. Direct vote and secret ballot in all elections. Universal and equal rights of suffrage without regard to color, creed,

or sex. Election-days to be legal holidays. The principle of minority representation to be introduced.

4. The people to have the right to propose laws (*initiative*) and to vote upon all laws of importance (*referendum*).

5. The members of all legislative bodies to be responsible to and subject to recall by the constituency.

6. Uniform law throughout the United States. Administration of justice to be free of charge. Abolition of capital punishment.

7. Separation of all public affairs from religion; church property to be subject to taxation.

8. Uniform national marriage laws. Divorce to be granted upon mutual consent, and upon providing for the care of the children.

Similar is the programme of the Australian Socialistic Union, established 1890 in Sydney, New South Wales. That these principles are carefully propagated not only in conventions, but also among the masses, may be seen from a popular catechism printed for the use of the Knights of Labor in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., 1888.

What are our six demands? the Knight is asked. The answer is:

I. The equal rights of all men to the soil.

II. That lands held for speculative purposes should be taxed to their full value.

III. That money should be issued by the government and not through banks.

IV. That the railroads and telegraphs be managed by the government.

V. That children under fifteen years should not be employed in workshops, mines, or factories.

VI. That all workmen should be properly protected while at work.

Again the Knight is questioned as follows:

Do you believe that all men are created equal? Yes.

Have they equal rights to life? Yes.

Have they equal rights to the soil, the land—in other words, to the means of living? Yes.

What right has the people to the land of the earth? The right to the use of it.

Has one generation more right to the earth than another? No. . . .

If the land of any country belongs to the people of that country, to whom does the rent belong? To the people who have a right to the land.

After the aspirant to knighthood is further instructed on the blessedness attendant on the socialization of the soil and the management of all monopolies by the government, this query is put to him: "With all monopolies managed by the government and all men sharing alike the benefits arising from the ownership of land, would the workingmen's condition be improved?" The answer is worthy of Bebel himself: "Yes. He would find himself in a paradise, where it would be a pleasure to labor."

These samples of socialism from the United States may suffice to show that Americans in their own practical way have largely gleaned from the theories of Marx and of the German socialists. This is manifest to any one who is slightly acquainted with the writings of Bellamy and Henry George.[1]

[1] See Rae's recent learned work entitled "Socialism," *passim.*

CHAPTER II.

UNTENABLENESS OF THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM.

SECTION I.

PHILOSOPHICAL AND RELIGIOUS ASSUMPTIONS.

I. *Equal Rights of all Men.*

IN demonstrating the untenableness of the principles of socialism we shall not confine ourselves merely to its economic aspects. Such a consideration would be one-sided and imperfect. For although the chief demands of socialism are of an economic character, yet its theories are based upon principles which belong to other departments of science.

1. The fundamental principles of socialism belong not to economical but to metaphysical science. Foremost among its tenets is the *equality* of man, not from a physical but from a juridical standpoint. We do not, therefore, contend that the socialists demand the absolute equality of all; they insist only on the *equal rights* of all. But this demand tacitly presupposes absolute equality. We must, therefore, distinguish their demand from their assumption.

There has been some doubt as to whether this

supposition of the absolute equality of men from which modern socialists proceed is essential to socialism. Schäffle, who enjoys considerable authority among socialists, seems to deny this. Paulsen even goes so far as to assert that socialism must assume the character "*not* of the party of *equality*, but of the party of *equal rights;* not of the party of false democracy, but of the party of moral and intellectual—that is, natural—aristocracy."[1] However, he seems to ignore the very essence of socialism as a labor organization. True, the socialists characterize themselves as the party of justice. But whence have they the right to set themselves up as the vindicators of justice, and to brand modern society wholesale as unjust? If they wish to answer this question they must either point to the *equality* of all men, from which equality equal rights would follow; or they must maintain that *labor* is the only source of just property. By substituting for the existing aristocracy a nondescript natural aristocracy, the laboring classes would profit little and the existing social misery which the socialists would dispel would hardly be removed.

In fact, the socialists demand "equal rights and equal duties for all"—"the removal of all social and political inequality" (Gotha programme). Bebel[2] and Stern[3] and others demand the equality of the conditions of existence for all. According to Liebknecht[4] there shall exist in the state of the future *absolute equality of rights*, and this equality is to be the only limit to freedom. By such absolute

[1] System der Ethik, p. 729.
[2] Die Frau, p. 150.
[3] Thesen über den Socialismus, p. 19.
[4] Berliner Volksblatt, 1890, No. 253.

equality of rights we cannot understand merely equality before the law; for such equality already exists to a certain extent—and that not only politically, but also juridically and socially. In the German Empire, for instance, the law makes no distinctions of ranks and classes in conferring political rights. There exists, therefore, political equality before the law. Nor does the German Empire make any distinction in the administration of justice, so that there exists also juridical equality strictly so called. Nay, not even is there any social inequality before the law in regard to domestic rights or commercial and industrial life. Each one is free to take up any branch of industry or any trade or profession he pleases, if he only complies with the necessary legal conditions.

When, therefore, the socialists take equal rights as their watch-word and in the name of this equality make war upon society, they do not mean by equal rights equality before the law, but *the actual and absolute equality of rights in actual social life.* For, notwithstanding the equality before the law, there actually exists the greatest inequality of rights in political as well as in other regards. The political rights, for instance, of members of the legislature, ministers of state, and other officials are different from those of electors; and, notwithstanding the abstract equal rights of all, it is but the very few who become members of parliament, ministers, or imperial state councillors. Much less is there actual equality of rights in social life. There are rich and poor, learned and unlearned, laborers and employers. In short, society is divided into countless professions and callings, all attended with different rights and duties. It is particularly this inequality that the

socialists would remove. This demand has a prominent place in the Gotha programme—the removal of all social and political inequality. Such a demand can have some semblance of justice only in the supposition of the absolute equality of all men. In the course of our inquiry we shall have occasion to show that the socialistic organization, if it has any foundation at all, is based on the absolute equality of all men. Let us, therefore, examine this assumption itself.

2. True it is that all men have a like nature—that all men are perfectly equal, if considered in the abstract, according to their nature, apart from all concrete circumstances which must necessarily accompany actual existence. All have the same Creator, the same aim and end, the same natural moral law; all are members of one great family. Hence follows also that there are essential rights and duties which are, so to speak, necessarily engrafted on human nature and are the same with all men. Every individual human being has, therefore, at all times and in all places, the right to be treated as a man. Every individual has also the right to the strictly necessary conditions of existence. But that all men must enjoy the same conditions of existence cannot be proved from the equality of men in the abstract.

3. As soon as we consider men as they really are we are confronted with the greatest possible variety from which necessarily arises a diversity of rights and duties. Some are in helpless infancy or tender youth; others in the strength of manhood; others again are declining to their graves in decrepit old age. From this variety necessarily follows a diversity of rights and duties. Or should helpless children

and decrepit old men and women possess the same rights and duties as men in the prime of life? Should the infirm have the same rights and duties as the healthy, women the same rights as men? We are aware that many socialists advocate such equality, particularly the absolute equality between man and woman. The marriage-union, according to them, is "a private contract without the intervention of a public functionary." Woman may, according to their tenets, love whom she pleases and as long as she pleases. If she is not satisfied with one alliance, she may loose the knot and bless some other with her love. Married or unmarried, she is to enjoy perfect equality with the sterner sex.[1]

Bebel, however, may permit us to ask him: Must, then, men in turn with their wives rock the cradle, cook, knit and darn, and attend to all womanly household duties? And, again, must women as well as men descend into the mines, perform the duties of coachmen, draymen, sailors, etc.? Must they gird on the sword, take up the knapsack and rifle, and march to the field of battle? In order to effect such equality we would have to go back to the most barbarous times, and even then this equality would be frustrated by the weakness of the female sex. For why did nature bestow on woman so totally different an organization—talents, inclinations, and characteristics so different from those of man? Is not this intellectual, moral, and physical diversity an evident indication that the Creator of both natures has set for them a totally different task in society?

Bebel, it is true, thinks that the difference of endowments and inclinations in the two sexes is

[1] Bebel, Die Frau, p. 192.

only the result of education—or rather of that "slavery" to which woman has been thus far subjected, and that with the change of education and social standing this difference would altogether disappear. This assertion is untrue. It is sufficiently refuted by the fact that this difference between man and woman confronts us everywhere, among all nations, even of the most diverse customs. It follows also of necessity from the physical organization of woman and from the duties and cares which are inseparably connected with motherhood.

Apart from the diversity of age and sex, even though we could picture to ourselves men and women in equal circumstances, such equality in the conditions of existence of all is unnatural. We have only to recall to mind how different men are in regard to inclinations, talents, characters, health, physical strength, natural wants—to say nothing of the moral differences in regard to prudence, temperance, industry, economy—to see the utter impossibility of this supposed equality. From this variety follows also diversity in regard to honors, influence, property, social standing, which could be prevented only by continued violence.

To bring home to ourselves with evidence the utter impossibility of such absolute equality, let us suppose, for instance, four brothers who bear the greatest resemblance to one another. Three of them get married; the fourth prefers to remain unmarried. His rights and duties are quite different from those of the other three. Of these we shall suppose that one remains childless, the second has three children, and the third has eight. Their duties and rights have varied still more. Though we have admitted that all four brothers were, in the beginning, equally

situated in regard to home, property, and business relations, yet, after some ten years have passed, the conditions of their existence have become very different. The first has to provide for himself only. The second has to provide for himself and his wife; the third has to provide for five persons, and the fourth for ten. If now we take into account the difference in regard to talent, industry, etc., it becomes manifest that in less than half a generation the circumstances of the four brothers have changed in many regards. And if, moreover, sickness, misfortune, persecutions have exercised a disturbing influence upon the relations, may it not easily happen that within one generation the equality has altogether disappeared? And what differences will set in during the following generation which has already begun under such unequal conditions?

Socialists may object that in the preceding example we suppose the now existing conditions of society, but in the socialistic state of society such a development would be altogether impossible, as the care of children, of the sick, etc., would be in the hands of the community, woman would take the same part in labor as man; and each one would live upon the produce of his own labor. Very true; but we maintain only that inequality is the necessary outcome of the natural development of man, and that socialism could not without external violence prevent such inequality. A gardener may effect that all the trees of a park are equally high, or rather equally low; but only by continued and violent pruning. Such an unnatural condition, however, cannot be lasting.

4. So far we have taken only the family into

consideration. But beyond the boundaries of the family, owing to the countless shades of inclinations and wants, various social gradations are formed. It is only by an extensive division of labor that men can satisfy their wants and propensities and arrive at a higher degree of culture. But the division of labor again produces as a necessary result the division of society into various ranks and professions, which have for their basis the different inclinations and talents of men, and afford to each individual the opportunity of choosing a suitable vocation.

However we may conceive of an advanced state of society, there will always be ignorant people, and, consequently, always teachers. Have the pupil and the teacher the same rights and duties? There will always be apprentices and masters. Can the master and the apprentice have the same rights and duties? There will always be sick persons and persons decrepit with old age; and, consequently, there will be physicians and surgeons and nurses. Can these have exactly the same rights and duties as those intrusted to their charge? There will always be agriculture, commerce, industry, science and art. Shall those who devote themselves to these various pursuits have exactly the same conditions of life? Shall all men and women, in the same way, be trained to the profession and practice of all these various avocations?

The more moderate class of socialists, it is true, are inclined to admit different vocations with different emoluments in "the state of the future." On the other hand, the extremists—to whom Bebel belongs—would do away with all inequality in the different vocations. By education and culture,

according to Bebel, it is possible to make all men fit for all professions, so that each one "in his turn" is fit to discharge all the various functions of social life. This assumption, however, is absurd, and is based on an incredible exaggeration of human abilities, as we shall have occasion to show hereafter; but it is quite logical, for it follows with rigid necessity from the principles of socialism. He who has once undertaken, on the ground of the equality of all men, to upset the existing order of society, and to create equal conditions of life for all, cannot permit that society freely adopts professions or callings which, in regard to emolument, labor, and dangers, are so widely different from one another—as are, for instance, the professions of an author or an artist, and the employment of a miner, a fireman, a stable-boy, a hod-carrier, a laborer in a chemical factory or spinning-mill.

In recent times the opinion has been expressed that socialism might be satisfied with *equality* of gain; that it actually demanded equality of all conditions of life and the removal of all social inequality; but that socialism was not constrained, in virtue of its principles, to insist on this latter demand, and it would be satisfied with the equality of industrial conditions. This demand, however, is ambiguous. If it only implies that the law should afford all equal possibility of acquiring wealth, we already possess this equality. For the law of itself gives no advantage to any one more than to another in regard to the acquisition of wealth. But the socialists manifestly demand something more. If, on the other hand, they understand by equal industrial advantages that the state should give all its subjects the same means of acquiring wealth, in other words, that the state should make an equal distribution of property, we should again, within a few months or years, have a similar inequality, and the division would have to be made anew.

If by equal industrial conditions they would understand that the state should withdraw from private control all the means of wealth, and make it impossible for individuals to acquire productive capital and bring about inequality of property, we have again the genuine socialistic theory. But the question arises: whence does the state derive the right to withdraw all the means of production from private control, and to enforce this equality in the means of acquiring wealth; in other words, whence does the state derive the right to make all capital public property, and thus violently to prevent the more intelligent, more industrious, and the abler classes from acquiring more than the indolent and unskilful? Why compel all individuals, in like manner, to accommodate themselves in their industrial methods to the rule and direction of the community? This demand can be justified only in the assumption of the absolute equality of all men, and their equal right to the goods of this earth. And thus we stand again upon the tacit supposition of socialism, which we have shown to be untenable—that all men have absolutely the same rights.

II. *Undue Emphasis of Industrial Life.*

With the false supposition of the absolute equality of all men are intimately connected other erroneous assumptions. The socialists would make all men, without exception, take an active part in the plan of social production. The Gotha programme demands *universal compulsory labor*, while the Erfurt platform evidently supposes such an obligation. Every individual must enter the service of the community and receive his portion of the common labor dealt out to him. No one is allowed to possess any productive property of his own, or to produce anything on his own account. For the satisfaction of all his wants he is directed to the state magazines. The education and instruction of youth are to be

the business of the state, as is also the care of the sick. In short, every one is to have just so much freedom and so much right as the community concedes to him. We shall have occasion to discuss this point more at length hereafter. Suffice it here to say that in the socialistic theory society or the state has the *unlimited right of disposal over every individual;* that every one is destined in the first instance for the service of the community, and that for the mere purpose of industrial production.

This is the pagan idea of the state as we find it in Plato and other heathen writers. It does not tolerate any personal rights as against the community; it also virtually denies that the first and highest end of man upon earth is the service of God and the attainment of perfect happiness after death. As a logical consequence of this pagan view of the state and of the individual, socialism *unduly exaggerates the importance of industrial life* or the production of wealth. As in the life of the individual the pursuit of earthly goods, if estimated according to its true import, occupies the last place in human activity, so also it should be in the life of human society at large. The acquirement of the means of subsistence is subordinate to the higher intellectual aspirations of man. The end of earthly goods is only to prepare the ground upon which higher and more ideal goods are produced.

Now, since it is impossible that all in the same way devote themselves to such various occupations, there must be different callings and states in life, which require long-continued preparation, and which do not all occupy the same place, but form a certain hierarchical order, consisting of various

grades subordinate to one another. By their very nature the various classes employed in the production of the necessaries of life (laborers, artisans, husbandmen, etc.) occupy the lowest grade, while the different professions naturally take a higher place on the social scale. We do not mean to imply, however, that the former are not worthy of all consideration and honor, or that those who are employed in procuring the daily necessaries of life have less merit before God: we would only say that the higher professions, considered in themselves, secure a higher rank in society, that they require higher endowments and greater culture, and, consequently, may claim greater consideration.

Now, what is the design of socialism? Socialism will make the laboring class the ruling one, and make labor capacity (the production of value) the standard of the social organization itself and of the social position of each member of society. Society is to become one great productive union. No one may withdraw himself from the duty of production. Unproductive, useless individuals shall not be tolerated. That in such an organization, in which all members are forced to be productive, there is no room for higher callings—e.g., for the priesthood consecrated to the divine service, for religious orders, for those who devote themselves to arts and sciences for their own sake—goes without saying. This consideration leads us to another erroneous feature of socialism.

III. *Materialistic View of Life.*

1. Socialism considers *human life* merely from its temporal or earthly standpoint. And, in fact, how

could a system which proceeds from the supposition that man is created by God for eternity, and is placed here on earth to merit heaven by the fulfilment of the divine will—how could such a system set up material production as the highest standard of society, and allow a share of earthly goods only to those who take an actual part in production? Could such a system regard religion as a matter of indifference or put it aside as a thing not worth caring for? Thus we see that the fundamental idea of socialism is in contradiction not only with Christianity, but with every form of religion. The decalogue of socialism are the supposed rights of men; its god is the democratic, socialistic state; its last end is earthly enjoyment for all; the object of its worship is production.

2. The first demand of socialism is tacitly based upon *atheism*. It demands perfect equality of rights and of the conditions of life for all, and that in every regard, but chiefly in social life. Every inequality in social life is characterized by socialism as an unbearable fraud and oppression. Although reason and revelation teach that the servant should be subject to his master, the inferior to his superior, the wife to her husband, and the child to the parent, and that for conscience' sake, because it is the will of God, yet socialism considers all this as a violation of the equal rights and duties of all. According to socialistic views, each one has the right to submit to those laws and that authority which he himself has acknowledged and approved. Thus the *principle of authority*, as coming from God and requiring obedience for conscience' sake, is subverted. That socialism dissolves the marriage union, not only in the

Christian sense, but also in the juridical sense, we shall have occasion to see when we treat of the relation of socialism to the family.

3. Socialism is no less in contradiction with Christian teaching on the rights of property. Christ no more emphatically condemns the immoderate quest of riches, and no more forcibly recommends poverty of spirit as a higher degree of perfection, than He clearly acknowledges the justice of private property, also in the materials of labor. He has not abolished the moral precepts of the Old Law as laid down in the Decalogue: nay, He has enforced them anew.[1] In the New Testament as well as in the Old it is a breach of the divine law even to covet our neighbor's field, house, or oxen. To the rich youth who asked to be instructed on the way to salvation Christ answered that he should keep the commandments of the Decalogue; and He added the counsel: "If thou wilt be perfect, sell what thou hast and give to the poor, . . . and come, follow Me." Could Christ speak thus if He considered private property, to which certainly belong houses and lands, as unjust? To Ananias St. Peter answered he might have kept his land if he chose. Among the first followers of Christ and the apostles there were many who possessed private property (e.g., Martha, Joseph of Arimathea, Philemon). Like Christ Himself and His apostles, the Church at all times acknowledged the right of private property in the materials of labor (lands, tenements, produce, etc.). It is therefore contrary to the teaching of Christianity to condemn all such private property as unjust or to brand it as "theft," as socialism actually does.

[1] Cf. Wilmers, Lehrbuch der Religion, vol. iii. p. 72, sq.

4. Christianity forbids *revolution*—that is, a violent subversion of the lawfully existing social order. But socialism is, according to the acknowledgment of its own leaders and representatives, an essentially revolutionary movement. True, when this reproach is made to social democrats they take refuge in the ambiguity of the word "revolution"; they say that there are also peaceful and constitutional revolutions. However, this answer is illusory: the learned and cultured leaders of the social democratic party are not so simple as to believe that all private owners would freely surrender their possessions to the community, that the Church would freely renounce its institutions and its possessions, that monarchs would freely descend from their thrones, and that the nobility would sacrifice their inherited rights.

Karl Marx declared at the congress of the Hague in 1872: "In most countries of Europe *violence* must be the lever of our social reform. *We must finally have recourse to violence in order to establish the rule of labor.* . . . The revolution must be universal, and we find a conspicuous example in the Commune of Paris, which has failed because in other capitals—Berlin and Madrid—a simultaneous revolutionary movement did not break out in connection with this mighty upheaval of the proletariat in Paris." These words require no comment.

Bebel, commenting in the German Reichstag upon occurrences in Paris, says: "These events are but a slight skirmish in the war which the proletariat is prepared to wage against all palaces." On another occasion he declared that this reform cannot be brought about by sprinkling rosewater. In one of his works[1] he writes as follows on the application of violence: "We must not shudder at the thought of the possible employment of violence; we must not raise

[1] Unsere Ziele, p. 44.

an alarm-cry at the suppression of 'existing rights,' at violent expropriation, etc. History teaches that at all times new ideas, as a rule, were realized by a violent conflict with the defenders of the past, and that the combatants for new ideas struck as deadly blows as possible at the defenders of antiquity. Not without reason does Karl Marx, in his work on Capital, exclaim: Violence is the obstetrician that waits on every ancient society which is about to give birth to a new one; violence is in itself a social factor." From all this it appears to evidence that socialism and Christianity are no less opposed to each other than darkness and light, and that whoever knows what socialism is, and what it aims at, can only at the sacrifice of Christianity and religion in general join its ranks.

5. Yet why should we labor so much to show the conflict between socialism and Christianity while we have the *express official testimony* of the socialists themselves upon the fact? The German social democracy in its official platform declares religion to be a "private matter." Thus the socialistic state, at least, is altogether divorced from religion, —non-religious and atheistic. And since the entire education of youth, according to socialists, is the business of the state, it follows that education should take no cognizance of religion; in other words, that it should be non-religious and godless. The community as such should not concern itself with God and religion, but must consider both as equally indifferent. Such principles can manifestly proceed only from contempt of religion, and can only lead to open persecution of the Church. Let us suppose that the Church wishes to erect bishoprics and parishes, to appoint priests for the care of souls, to control the religious education of youth, to make laws and regulations in regard to marriage, to in-

stitute feasts, etc.—would, in that case, the socialistic state leave the Church at perfect liberty? Would it be possible for church and state, which are both concerned with the same human beings, to avoid a conflict? And if the socialistic state would force priests and religious, nay, even bishops, to abandon their vocations and to contribute their share to the public production of wealth—would not that be an open violation of the Church's rights? Would it not lead to perpetual conflicts, which would finally develop into downright persecution? And what would be the result if the Church would claim a right to at least so much ground as would suffice for its churches, convents, parsonages, hospitals, seminaries, etc., and, moreover, if it should demand labor-power and materials for the erection of such institutions? Would not the socialistic state, in that case, from its standpoint, be forced flatly to refuse such demands on the part of the Church, and thus violate the Church's most sacred rights, and take away, as it were, the ground from beneath her feet? The apparent permission of religion in the socialistic state as a private affair is, therefore, a mere illusion. Socialists are not prepared to give offence to those who still maintain in their hearts some attachment to religion by demanding from them all at once the surrender of religion. Of its very nature socialism is the enemy of every religion which undertakes to raise the aspirations of men from earth to heaven, and to preach to man that he does not live on bread alone.

6. It is not by mere chance that the most noted socialists are so outspoken in their hatred of religion,

and that they generally indulge in the most irreligious and blasphemous language against religion.

The expression "draft on eternity" (*Wechsel auf das Jenseits*), the trite blasphemy with which they characterize the Christian efforts of social reform, is well known. The *Social-Demokrat*, the recent official organ of the German socialists, had almost on every page the most virulent abuse of what it called "clerical ascendency," and was generally bristling with the most shocking blasphemies. And its successor, the Berlin *Volksblatt*, the present official party organ, yields in naught to its predecessor. In a Christmas reflection (No. 301) it accuses Christianity of fulfilling none of its promises. "We know," it says, "that Christianity has not brought redemption. We believe in no Redeemer; but we believe in redemption. No man, no God in human form, no Saviour, can redeem humanity. Only humanity itself—only laboring humanity—can save humanity."

Karl Marx allows no opportunity to pass without an open or covert thrust at Christianity. According to him, religion is an "absurd popular sentiment," a "fantastic degradation of human nature." "Man makes religion," he says, "not religion man." Then, again, religion is "the sentiment of a heartless world, as it is the spirit of spiritless conditions. It is the opinion of the people." "The abolition of religion as the deceptive happiness of the people is a necessary condition for their true happiness." "Religion is only an illusory sun, which revolves around man as long as man fails to revolve around himself."[1]

Bebel, in the words of the frivolous poet Heine, leaves "heaven to the angels and the sparrows."[2] Theology, if we are to believe him, is in contradiction with natural science, and will disappear in the society of the future.[3] Again: "The conviction that heaven is on this earth," and that "to

[1] Deutsch-Französ. Jahrbücher; Paris, 1844, p. 71. Volksblatt, No. 281. Kapital, vol. i. p. 19.

[2] Unsere Ziele, p. 38.

[3] Die Frau, p. 183.

die is to end all," will, in his opinion, impel all to live a natural life.[1] Another leader of the social democrats characterizes their philosophy as "atheism in religion, democratic republicanism in politics, collectivism in social economy."[2]

Liebknecht is of opinion that the dependence of the forms of religion upon economic conditions is so evident that there is no need of a conflict with religion. "We may peacefully take our stand upon the ground of socialism, and thus conquer the stupidity of the masses in as far as this stupidity reveals itself in religious forms and dogmas."[3]

Dietzgen, in his blasphemous sermons on "Religion and Social Democracy," surpasses all others in his savage onslaught against religion. As a characteristic of his style we quote the following: "If religion is to be understood as a belief in supersensible, material substances and forces, if it consists in a belief in higher gods and spirits, [social] *democracy has no religion.* In the place of religion it sets up the consciousness of the insufficiency of the individual, who for his perfection requires to be supplemented, and, consequently, subordinated to the entire body social. *A cultured human society is the supreme good in which we believe.* Our *hope* rests upon the organization of social democracy. This organization shall make that *love* a reality for which religious fanatics have displayed such irrational enthusiasm."[4]

Section II.

Economic Principles.

I. *Socialistic Theory of Value.*

Capital, according to Karl Marx, comes to the world "dripping from every pore from head to foot with blood and dirt."[5] It is, according to its very

[1] Die Frau, p. 188.

[2] Schäffle, Aussichtslosigkeit der Socialdemokratie, p. 3.

[3] Berliner Volksblatt, 1890, No. 281.

[4] Religion der Socialdemokratie, pp. 33, 34.

[5] Kapital, 4 ed., p. 726.

nature, nothing else than the unpaid-for, stolen labor of the workman; or, as Lassalle calls it, "ill-gotten gain." In order to substantiate this death verdict on capital Marx avails himself, as we have seen, of his peculiar theory of value. He distinguishes two kinds of value—value in use and value in exchange. *Value in use* consists in the utility of an object to satisfy human wants; *value in exchange* consists in the ratio in which commodities are exchangeable for one another. Value in use, it is true, forms the basis of value in exchange, in so far as only useful things can have exchange-value. But in other respects *value in exchange is entirely independent of value in use.* The exchange-value is determined by the labor embodied in an object. By labor, however, we are not to understand here this or that kind of labor—e.g., tailoring or shoemaking—but human "labor in the abstract."

"A value in use or an object has value (exchange-value) because human labor considered in the abstract is embodied or materialized in it. But how are we to measure the amount of its value? By the amount of 'value-creating substance,' i.e., labor, contained in it. The quantity of labor itself is determined by the time employed, and the labor-time again is measured by the unit of certain periods, as hours, days, etc."[1] By labor-time we are to understand, according to the explanation of Marx, the "socially necessary labor-time," or the time required "to produce a certain value with given normal social conditions of production, and with the average social degree of skill and intensity of labor."[2] How Marx has utilized the principle that exchange-value is something intrinsically independent of use-value and consists only in "crystallized labor-time" for the explanation of capitalistic "surplus-making," we have already shown.

[1] Kapital, p. 5. [2] Ibid., p. 14.

For the fundamental principle that the exchange-value of an object is not determined by its use-value, but exclusively by the labor expended upon it, Marx can appeal to the authority of the greatest political economists, Adam Smith, Ricardo, and others. Socialism in this as in many other regards is only the lineal descendant of liberalism; it only draws the logical inferences from the principles of liberalism. Not until Marx, Lassalle, and other socialists had taken hold of this principle to use it as a deft weapon against private capital did any misgiving arise concerning it; then authors began to abandon it.

Marx, moreover, rightly distinguishes between value in use and value in exchange. This distinction we find already adopted by Aristotle[1] and his commentators. Aristotle distinguishes a twofold *use* of earthly goods: the one is proper to an object according to its peculiar character (χρῆσις οἰκεία); the other is common to it with all other objects (χρῆσις οὐκ οἰκεία). The philosopher illustrates this distinction by the example of a shoe. A shoe has a twofold use: the first is peculiar to it in contradistinction to other objects, and consists in this, that it can be used for the protection of the foot; the second consists in this, that it may be exchanged for other goods. This second use is common to the shoe with all other objects of merchandise. It may therefore be called common use or secondary use.

This distinction of use-value is much clearer, simpler, and more objective than those which we generally meet with in the works of modern political economists. Many call use-

[1] Politic. I. 9. St. Thom. in I. Pol. l. 7. Silv. Maurus in I. Polit. c. 6, n. 2.

value the fitness of an object for the use of the possessor himself, and exchange-value the fitness of the object to be given in exchange. But exchange itself is a use of the object by the possessor. Consequently the first member of the definition contains also the second. Others call use-value immediate value, and exchange-value mediate value. Others[1] again reject this distinction altogether, and divide value into subjective and objective. As often as we shall, according to the ruling custom, distinguish between use-value and exchange-value, we shall understand by use-value the fitness of an article for all kinds of use, the use of exchange alone excepted.

If Marx had confined himself to the distinction of these two kinds of value, no serious objection could be raised against him; *but he has completely rent them asunder.* Value in use, according to him, is no factor in the determination of value in exchange. But this assertion on his part is unproved and incorrect.

1. It is *unproved.* The chief argument which Marx adduces for his opinion is the following: Value in exchange must be something *common* to all merchandise; but this common element cannot be anything else than the human labor embodied in it, taken in the abstract. Therefore the labor contained in an object forms its exchange-value.

We grant that exchange-value is something common to all merchandise, because the various objects of merchandise may be compared with each other according to their value in exchange. But we deny that this common element consists in the labor contained in them alone. Marx does not produce any arguments for this opinion, but only mere assertions.

[1] Schönberg's Handbuch der politischen Oekonomie, 2 ed., vol. i. p. 156.

"The common element in all kinds of wares cannot be a geometrical, physical, chemical, or any other natural quality of the goods themselves. Their physical properties come into consideration only in as far as they go to constitute their utility or use-value. On the other hand, the exchangeableness of wares is evidently characterized by abstracting from their usefulness. In regard to exchange the use-value of one object is just as much as the use-value of another, provided it be forthcoming in due proportion. As to their use-value, goods, in the first instance, differ in quality; but as to their exchange-value they differ only in quantity, and contain not a particle of use-value." [1]

This passage contains only assertions in lieu of arguments; nay, false statements presented to us as "evident." And upon these statements depends the whole system of Karl Marx. We are surprised, in fact, that Marx so confidently affirms without proof that apart from labor there is no common element in different goods. Aristotle, to whom he repeatedly appeals, could have taught him better. This great philosopher teaches expressly that there is a common element in all wares, according to which they can be compared with one another and estimated. This common measure or standard of exchangeable goods, according to the philosopher,[2] is usefulness, that is, their fitness for supplying the wants of mankind.

2. But the assertion of Marx that labor alone constitutes exchange-value is not only gratuitous: it is also *untrue*. Unwittingly Marx himself has written his own refutation. He says: Within the

[1] Kapital, p. 12.

[2] *Δεῖ ἄρα ἑνί τινι πάντα μετρεῖσθαι . . . τοῦτο δ'ἐστὶ τῇ μὲν ἀληθείᾳ ἡ χρεία, ἧ παντα συνέχει.*—Ethic. v. 8.

same ratio of exchange-value, the use-value of one object is as great as that of another if the commodity is only forthcoming in the same proportion. Why must the use-value be forthcoming in the same proportion? Evidently because in the determination of the exchange-value the usefulness of an object is by no means indifferent, but a decisive element. Moreover, how is it that, even according to the concessions of Marx himself, *useful objects only* can have exchange-value for society? Certainly because use-value or utility is an essential element in exchange-value. If one, for instance, with the greatest expenditure of labor manufactured boots from pasteboard, yet he could not find sale for them, they would have no exchange-value, because they would be useless; in other words, *because they would have no use-value*. Use-value is, therefore, an essential element of exchange-value.

But there are objects of use-value which have no exchange-value. Air and light, for instance, are useful though not exchangeable commodities. Very true; but what follows from this fact? Only this, that mere usefulness does not suffice to constitute exchange-value; that other conditions must be added; but it by no means follows that those things which have exchange-value do not owe this value at least in part to their usefulness. What would Marx say to the following argument? There are men who are no artists; therefore the notion of man does not belong to the notion of an artist. The conclusion drawn by Marx is no more logical. In order that a useful object may have exchange-value it must be fit to pass into the exclusive possession of an individual, and must not be forthcoming

in such quantities that all can dispose of it at pleasure. But this supposed, the exchange-value of an object depends chiefly upon its use-value, or utility. In the primeval forests of South America wood has no exchange-value, either because there is no one to use it, or because every one can have it for nothing, like air and water. But suppose a merchant brings several shiploads of different kinds of wood to a European harbor, what will then be the standard of its value? Is it the amount of labor, the amount of expense and time, which the transportation has cost? Certainly not; otherwise all different species of wood conveyed from South America would sell at the same price, which is not the case. The better and more durable material will sell at a higher rate. Fine cedar or mahogany, abstracting altogether from the labor expended on it, has a much greater exchange-value than pine or birch.

By a thousand such instances we might show that the value or price of an article is determined in the first place by the general estimate of its usefulness. Good wine sells at a higher rate than bad wine, although the vintner may have expended the same amount of labor on the preparation of both. Why do our mine-owners sell coal from the same mine at different prices? Because the quality is different. In short, it is the quality, or the different degrees of objective goodness, that generally determines the exchange-value of objects independently of the amount of labor consumed upon them.

It would be carrying coal to Newcastle to attempt any further proofs of this truth. Nor can it be objected against the examples alleged that in all cases labor is necessary to give the object real ex-

changeable value, for we do not deny that labor has a certain influence upon the exchange-value; but we do say that labor alone does not constitute exchange-value. For the rest, labor generally comes into account only as far as it tends to give usefulness to a thing. Besides, there are in nature also objects which require no labor in order to be made useful, but which may be directly appropriated and exchanged for other commodities. Such are, for instance, coal oil, wild fruits, etc.[1]

If that which gives exchange-value to things is not labor alone, but above all their utility and fitness to supply human wants, all further inferences against modern private capital which Marx thence deduces have no convincing force. Most particularly is the conclusion incorrect that the exchange-value of human labor-power is to be determined by the expense of its production. For even in the supposition that two laborers required exactly the same amount for the sustenance of themselves and their families, yet their labor-power could have quite different exchange-values, if the one was more expert, more talented, skilful, and trusty than the other. What determines the exchange-value of labor-power as well as of all other commodities is, in the first place, its usefulness.

To meet a possible objection we would here remark that even in the socialistic state the exchange-value of goods would still remain, and could not, even in socialistic circumstances, be determined by the labor spent in its production; for not only in commerce with foreign nations, but also in the

[1] Cf. Von Hammerstein, S. J., Stimmen aus Maria Laach, vol. x. p. 426. Hitze, Kapital und Arbeit, 1880, p. 9, sq.

division of produce among individuals, the exchange-value of goods would have to be taken into account, and even in this case it would be determined chiefly by the standard of usefulness. If two laborers in the socialistic state would perform the same amount of work, it would be unjust to give to one as a remuneration a case of Johannisberger or Rüdesheimer, and to the other the same amount of bad Mosel wine, or cider, on the plea that both the productions cost the same amount of labor. So also in the socialistic state more labor could be procured by a peck of good wheat than by the same amount of bad wheat, although the expenditure of labor upon the bad wheat may be just the same as upon the good. The same may be said of all similar commodities.

II. *The Iron Law of Wages.*

1. *The iron law of wages* was the chief weapon used by Lassalle against existing capitalism. Herein liberal social economists, Adam Smith, Ricardo, J. B. Say, and others had prepared the way for him. Lassalle appeals with seeming comfort to these great authorities in establishing his iron law.

"The iron economic law," says Lassalle, "which in our day, under the rule of supply and demand, determines the wages of the laborer, is the following: The average wages is always confined to the necessary sustenance which, according to the custom of a given nation, is necessary to insure the possibility of existence and propagation. This is the point around which actual wages oscillates like the swing of a pendulum, without ever remaining long either above or below this standard. Wages cannot permanently rise over this average; otherwise there would result from the easier and better condition of the laborers an increase

of the laboring population and a supply of hands which would again reduce the wages to, or even below, the average point.

"Nor can wages permanently fall below the average of the necessary sustenance of life; for this would give rise to emigration, celibacy, prevention of propagation, and finally the diminution of the laboring population by want, which consequently would reduce the supply of hands and again raise wages to its former or even a higher rate. The actual average wages consists, therefore, in a constant undulation around this centre of gravity, to which it must always return, around which it must revolve, standing sometimes above and sometimes below." [1]

"That laborers and wages continually revolve in a circle, the circumference of which can at most reach the margin of what is barely sufficient to satisfy the necessary wants of human sustenance . . . . is a circumstance which never changes." [2]

Lassalle, it is true, admits that these customary necessities of life are greater in our day than in former times; but notwithstanding all this the laboring classes are, in given social circumstances, always confined to what is barely necessary for the continuance of existence and of propagation. Therefore, according to Lassalle, the laborer has no prospect of bettering his condition.[3]

According to the teaching of Ricardo, the average wages will always, in the long run, coincide with the cost of production. Ricardo distinguishes between the natural price and the market price of labor. The natural price is that which is necessary generally to make existence and propagation possible. The market price, on the other hand, is that which under the law of supply and demand is actually paid for labor. The latter may sometimes exceed the natural price, and sometimes fall below it; but it will always fall back to the natural price. It may be conceded that Lassalle has expressed this law in more odious terms than

[1] Offenes Antwortschreiben, p. 10. Arbeiter-Lesebuch, p. 5.
[2] Offenes Antwortschreiben, p. 12.
[3] Arbeiter-Lesebuch, p. 27.

did Ricardo, but in substance their teaching exactly coincides. Besides Ricardo, Adam Smith, and Say, Lassalle cites for his opinion also Malthus, Bastiat, and John Stuart Mill.

2. This is the dreadful law of which socialists have made use until the most recent times to discredit the institution of private property.[1] But they appeal to this law without reason; for although the law were correct nothing would thence follow against private ownership. For the law is based upon the supposition of unlimited competition in industry and the supreme rule of supply and demand; but these excesses can be remedied without the wholesale abolition of private property. Until the most recent times there existed almost everywhere certain social restrictions which afforded protection to the weak against the unjust oppression of the strong. It is the business of economic policy to see that by the co-operation of civil legislation, on the one hand, and private effort, on the other, a certain organization may be brought about, suited to the modern conditions of industry, which will secure protection for the weak against the violence of the strong. If this is once attained, the iron wage law, as conceived and formulated by Lassalle, will soon fall into abeyance.

Social democrats in their attacks against the existing order of things are cunning, but not always honest. "Behold the dread iron law of wages, which fastens you to want and misery. Only social democracy can relieve you!" Thus they exclaim in the meetings of the laboring classes;—just as if every one who disapproved of unlimited competition

[1] Cf. Gotha programme, given above.

was bound to join the socialistic ranks. But the most noted socialists know full well that between unlimited competition and socialism there are many stages. We Catholics too—and we believe that orthodox Protestants agree with us on this point—wish that the laboring and agricultural classes be legally protected against the ascendancy of capital; we too wish to contribute to the utmost of our power towards securing even for the humblest laborer a comfortable domestic life. What is necessary for this consummation we have had occasion to show at greater length in our treatment of the rights of the state.[1] Here we shall only say that socialism is not the right remedy against existing social ills. It may remove, it is true, unlimited competition; but it can remove it only by the suppression of all free action, by forcing all the members of the state into the grooves of a mechanical industrial state organization.

3. We might content ourselves with the preceding exposition as far as the defence of private property is concerned. But since the iron wage law plays such a prominent part in socialistic literature we deem it expedient here to submit it to a closer examination.

a. If by the iron law Lassalle would only assert that under the rule of supply and demand a certain tendency exists to confine wages generally to what is barely necessary for the support of life, we would have no quarrel with him. For this tendency is a natural result of the selfishness of the rich, who are at the same time the mightier class. The average man is naturally inclined to purchase at a low and

[1] Cf. Moralphilosophie, vol. ii. p. 508, sqq.

to sell at a high rate. As the laborer wishes to sell his labor-power at the highest possible rate, so also the employer will endeavor to purchase labor at the lowest possible figure. But the rich employer is commonly the mightier, and will therefore succeed oftener to reduce wages below the normal figure than the laborer will succeed in raising it above the normal standard. Yet this universal tendency, which is the result of human selfishness, is by no means an economic law; else it might be also regarded as an economic law that dealers adulterate goods and that men grow rich by idleness.

b. That Lassalle's principle can be regarded as an economic law lacks every semblance of proof.[1] In order that an economic law, in the proper sense of the word, may be established, we must have a fact which from certain permanent causes necessarily exists in all places and at all times. This, however, is not the case with the supposed law of Lassalle; or, if it is, it has not thus far been proved. Let us examine the arguments which Lassalle, and before him Ricardo, adduces.

Wages, he says, cannot permanently rise beyond the average of what is barely necessary, according to custom, for the support of life; for else there would result an increase of the laboring population, and consequently of the supply of labor hands, which would again reduce wages to the former standard. But is it true, let us ask, that the laboring population will increase in the same proportion as the comforts of life? Such a statement cannot be borne

[1] Cf. Von Hammerstein, Stimmen aus Maria Laach, vol. x. p. 442; Schönberg's Handbuch der politischen Oekonomie, vol. i. p. 638, sq.

out; experience rather teaches the contrary. He who would find large families in England, say, must not seek them in the dwellings of the better-to-do laborers, or wealthier classes, but in the poorest tenements of the Irish laborers. In like manner, in America large families are to be found generally among the poorer classes of immigrants, while the birth-rate among the wealthier classes is notoriously low. Again, there is no land whose population generally is better off than France, and in no land is the rate of increase of population so low. And the reason is evident, even though we abstract altogether from religious influence. The better off a laboring family is the more it is concerned, as a rule, to maintain its social standing and to rise to a still higher rank. Rash marriages are more rarely entered upon in such circles than in the lower phases of society. It does not follow, however, that morals are purer in the higher than in the lower strata of society. There is another feature of the question, however, which Lassalle overlooks. Granted that better circumstances would produce an increase of population, yet it does not thence follow that the competition of the laborers would increase in like manner, for it would take a period of from sixteen to twenty years at least to produce any marked effect of such increase. Children are not from their very birth capable of competition. Consequently, according to the supposition of Lassalle, a laborer could for well-nigh a generation receive more wages than would be "necessary, according to existing customs, for the support of life and for propagation."

It may also happen that, despite the increase of the supply of labor wages does not diminish, as with

the supply also the demand may increase. If the demand for labor increases in the same proportion as the supply, wages remains the same; but it may easily happen that in many places, owing to new enterprises, the demand for labor may steadily increase for years, so that the increase of the number of laborers does not necessarily entail the diminution of wages.

We have no proof, therefore, that wages cannot for a considerable time exceed what is necessary for the maintenance of life. Nor has Lassalle proved that wages may not in some cases remain permanently below this standard. In that case he thinks emigration, celibacy, restriction of propagation, and finally a decrease of the laboring population resulting from misery would ensue, which would lessen the supply of labor hands and would bring wages back again to its former standard.

But, as we have already remarked, poverty does not lessen the birth-rate unless in the extreme case in which the laborers are literally starved. It can easily happen, and has happened, sad to say, that in many places the laboring classes have for a long time led a wretched life in the sense of Lassalle, without any perceptible diminution in the birth-rate. Poverty does not prevent marriages among the poor, nor does it prevent propagation. The poor are precisely in this respect often much more conscientious than those who call themselves the cultured classes. For the rest, even though poverty might produce a decrease in the birth-rate among the laborers, yet the effects of this diminution would be noticeable in the labor market only after the lapse of many years. In the mean time the gaps would be filled up by new

laborers coming from surrounding districts. Marx has established, on the data of inquiries made by physicians and inspectors of factories, that in many manufacturing districts the laborers had lived for many years in the most wretched misery without experiencing any increase of wages.[1] Lassalle's law, therefore, whether we consider it from its favorable or unfavorable aspect, remains unproved.

But it is not only *unproved:* it is simply *false.* The principal touchstone of economic laws are facts. Now what are the facts in regard to Lassalle's law? Is it true that laborers universally, at all times and in all places, obtain wages barely sufficient for the support of life and for propagation, and that they are confined within the limits of what is barely necessary? The question put in this way very soon reveals the exaggeration of Lassalle's statement. It is a fact that laborers often receive miserable wages —too little to live, too much to die. But there are also notable exceptions. We know many manufacturers who pay sufficient wages to their laborers—wages on which they can live decently, provided they have only a sense of order, temperance, and economy. But if the laborers would transform every Sunday into a day of revel their wages will certainly be insufficient. We here abstract from the fact that in all branches of industry there are many skilled laborers who receive higher pay, and to whom the iron law does not at all apply. And yet if this were an universal law it would also be applicable to this class of laborers.

Lassalle's law is, therefore, unproved and untrue, and cannot be used as a weapon against the existing

[1] Kapital, p. 613.

social order, much less can it be considered as a basis for the socialistic movement. If, however, from the sad facts which Lassalle advances to prove the existence of his iron law, and which we have in great part conceded, the conclusion should be inferred that *unlimited competition* is of evil, we are perfectly in accord with such an inference.

Karl Marx from the outset rejected Lassalle's iron law of wages. Nay, in his "Criticism of the Social Democratic Programme" he characterizes the insertion of this law in the platform as a "revolting retrogression;" and rightly so, from his own standpoint. According to Lassalle, the injustice of the wage system consists only in this, that the laborer's wages can never go beyond a low maximum, and thus the wage-worker is doomed to a miserable existence. According to Marx, the wage system in the capitalistic order of things is absolutely unjust and intolerable, because it makes the laborer the slave of the capitalist, and permits the workman to labor for his sustenance only, with the obligation to work a certain portion of the time for nothing merely to produce "surplus-value" for the capitalist. For "surplus-value" is always effected at the cost of the laborer; and as the capitalist is then only willing to carry on industry when his money is likely to produce "surplus-value," capital is of its very nature calculated for oppression. It is a "pitiless beast of prey." Hence he was forced to consider the adoption of Lassalle's iron law in the socialistic programme as a step backwards. Nay, the adoption of this law was diametrically opposed to, and an abandonment of, Marx's theory of "surplus-value." Hence we can easily understand his indignation at finding the *iron law* on the socialistic platform.

For the iron law of wages Marx substituted his theory of the so-called "*industrial reserve army*," or the "army of superfluous laborers, as the *Erfurt programme* calls it. Marx describes this idle army as a leaden weight that handicaps the laborer, a ballast which depresses wages to the lowest level, according to the exigence of capital. "That

law, which maintains the equilibrium between the surplus population or 'industrial reserve army' and the extent and intensity of accumulation, binds labor and capital faster together than the bolts of Hephæstus riveted Prometheus to the rocks. It brings in its wake an accumulation of misery proportioned to the accumulation of capital. The accumulation of wealth at one pole means at the same time the accumulation of misery, vexation, slavery, ignorance, bestialization, and moral degradation at the opposite pole, —that is, on the part of that class who are constrained to bring forth whatever they produce as capital." [1]

The "innate" laws of the capitalistic system with its unlimited competition effect that tradesmen and small manufacturers are supplanted by large industries and sink to the level of the proletariat. Then comes the turn of the capitalists themselves: the weaker capitalists are "slaughtered" by the stronger, and likewise fall back into the ranks of the proletarians. Hand in hand with this process of demolition goes another process, which tends to make the laborer superfluous. Competition forces the employer to ever cheaper production. He must, therefore, not only compel the laborer to prolong his labor as much as possible beyond the necessary labor-time, and substitute for the work of the laboring man the cheaper work of women and children; but he must also endeavor by the aid of machinery to make labor as productive as possible; nay, as far as possible, he must endeavor to make laborers superfluous. While, therefore, the capitalistic system, on the one hand, increases the ranks of the proletariat, it tends to make them, on the other hand, ever more superfluous. At times when industry is at high pressure the proletarians, who are always at the disposal of capital, are called into requisition; but on the approach of a crisis they are again "thrown into the streets," without employment. With the increase of the proletariat goes hand in hand the increase of misery!

That many of the phenomena pointed out by Marx are not merely the productions of an overheated imagination is but too true. To crown his description of the misery of

[1] Kapital, p. 611.

the laboring classes, he opens to us a horrible vista into the indescribable misery of the laborer in the most advanced of all industrial nations—England. We do not deny the facts; but we emphatically deny the correctness of the causes assigned by Marx. His exposition is altogether founded on his theory of "surplus-value," a factor of his theory on value in general, which we refuted above (p. 18). If the principle is proved to be false, the inferences will of themselves fall to the ground. Moreover, Marx's procedure presupposes his "materialistic view of history as an immanent (material) process of development."

The facts advanced by Marx, in as far as they can be shown to be true facts, may be explained without his theory of "surplus-value." They are the natural and necessary outcome of the liberal economic system. After the disintegration of society by the demolition of the classes and corporations of former times, and the introduction of absolute freedom of industry, the wild and disorderly struggle of competition began, in which craft and fraud and violence bore the victory. This struggle, together with modern mechanical discoveries, which proved advantageous almost exclusively to the capitalists, necessarily proved a disadvantage to the middle classes, and swelled the numbers of the proletariat. Add to this the increase of that pagan, materialistic selfishness that knows no principle of justice or charity, but makes all things subservient to self-interest, and it becomes easily intelligible that, without an "immanent" process of evolution in the sense of Herr Marx, such conditions of human misery as he describes, and as actually exist in some countries, may easily be induced.

As these conditions have been brought about, not by the laws of internal evolution, but by a perverse social policy, they may also be remedied by the opposite social policy, particularly by legislative protection of the weaker classes, by the institution and furtherance of co-operative organizations among the lower classes, but most especially by the revival of a true Christian spirit in society.

III. *Liberalism the Root of the Evil.*

After we have examined the principles of socialism, we may now answer the question in what relation it stands to modern liberalism. By liberalism we do not here understand, as is manifest, a certain political party known under this name, but rather a revolutionary and anti-Christian tendency in political, social, and religious matters. Socialists themselves acknowledge that they have only drawn the logical conclusions of those principles set up by liberals; and liberalism is accused by Catholics generally of having given birth to socialism. The liberals, on their part, with horror and indignation disclaim all connection with socialism. Liberalism does not profess, so say its defenders, to abolish private property: it will only make ownership free. Nor does it profess to advocate a servile industrial organization: it only advocates unrestricted freedom for all.

Notwithstanding all the protestations of the liberals, we cannot but consider socialism as the lineal descendant of liberalism, however much the parent may try to disown its offspring. The question is this, whether the principles set up and defended by liberals logically lead to socialism or not; and this question we believe must be answered in the affirmative. We are the more willing to enter fully upon this question since the answer to it will give us an opportunity to expose the true sources of the modern revolutionary movement. It would be erroneous to regard socialism, which now threateningly raises its head in all civilized nations, as an artificial movement, brought about by a few revolutionary char-

acters. No; this movement is a natural outgrowth of the modern social development, which owes its existence to liberalism.

1. The deepest roots of socialism are *atheism* and *materialism.* True, many atheists prefer to call themselves "monists" in order to escape the odious name of materialists; but it is all the same. For, whether we deify matter or reduce God into matter, it imports little, as both processes lead to the same result. Both theories equally contain the germs of socialism. If it is once admitted that all ends with this life, that man has no higher destiny than the lower animals which wallow in the mud, who, then, can require of the poor and oppressed, whose life is a continued struggle for existence, that they bear their hard lot with patience and resignation, and look on with indifference while their neighbors are clad in purple and fine linen, and daily revel at sumptuous banquets? Who can prove to them from the standpoint of atheism that it is meet and just that one should pine in poverty and want while another enjoys abundance of all things, since all have the same nature, and no reason can be given on atheistic grounds why the goods of this world should belong to one rather than to another? If the atheistic and materialistic theory is true, the demands of socialism are certainly just—that all the goods and enjoyments of this life should be equally divided among all; that it is, therefore, unjust that one should live in a magnificent palace and enjoy all pleasures without labor, while another is living in a squalid cellar or cold garret, and cannot even with the greatest effort obtain enough bread to appease his hunger.

Now, who is it that has preached and propagated atheism in all its forms? Who has fought by all ways and means to restrict the influence of Christianity in the school and in public life? Who is it that raised Darwinism to a dogma and popularized it for the ignorant masses? Who is it that even in our own day, in speech and in writing, in the chairs of universities and in public assemblies, preaches the grossest atheism? It is the representatives of *liberalism*, beginning with the French Encyclopedists down to our own university professors, who combat and decry the faith in God and in Christ the Saviour as stupidity and superstition. Hence Marx himself utters the sarcastic taunt against them, that atheism seems to them a venial fault compared with the crime of criticising the traditional conditions of property.[1] Wherein they have sinned therein they are punished.

2. The second great principle of the revolutionary party is *equality*. Here again socialism takes the same stand as liberalism, and draws the last consequence from its principles. Who invented the watchword *freedom*, *equality*, and *brotherhood*, and thus gave an appearance of right and even of duty to the bloody French Revolution? It was the representatives of liberalism. The worthies of the revolution—the Jacobins and Girondists—were the true forefathers of the modern liberals, who delight in their principles and phraseology, and continually talk freedom and equality. In virtue of this freedom and equality the ancient order of things was subverted; the privileges of the nobility and the

[1] Kapital, Vorrede, p. ix.

prerogatives of the Church were abolished; every memory of ancient institutions was effaced; the people were declared as sovereign; and, finally, the citizen "Capet" was brought to the scaffold. True, when the liberal bourgeoisie had once taken hold of the reins of government they were eager to put a stop to the further development of their principles. After the Church had been persecuted and, as far as this was possible to human power, suppressed, the heroes of the Revolution—Robespierre at their head—were eager to introduce the worship of a supreme being in order to check the masses. After the property of the Church and of the nobility had been seized upon, and individuals had enriched themselves from the wealth of the nation, it was declared in the constitution that private property was sacred and inviolable. After the aristocracy had been removed and the hierarchy of the Church had been suppressed, they determined to establish an aristocracy of genius and wealth. Was such a step consistent? Had they any right to demand of the people to be satisfied with that equality which conferred upon it a semblance of freedom, but left it totally bereft of protection, and finally surrendered it to the power of the capitalists? Was the people not entitled to require that they should redeem their promises, and finally establish perfect equality in real earnest? We consider that demand as logical and just, according to the principles of liberalism.

3. The close relation of socialism to liberalism may be still more clearly shown in reference to the adopted theory of value. He who accepts this modern socialistic theory of value—that the exchange-value of all productions is only the *result of*

labor, or accumulated labor—cannot possibly consider as just the conditions of modern production in which the laborer is always at a shortage, but must logically come to the principles of socialism. But who first established the socialistic theory of value? Is this theory the invention of socialism? By no means; it is the traditional doctrine of liberalism. Adam Smith, Ricardo, Say, and all the so-called classical political economists belong to the liberal school; and they have almost without exception laid down the principle that all value was to be credited to labor. Lassalle, as we have already shown, in establishing his theory of value could point to a stately line of liberal social economists. In recent times this theory, however, is either wholly abandoned or at least essentially modified by liberals. They soon discovered what a dangerous weapon they put into the hands of socialism. But it was too late. The fact cannot be concealed from the world that liberalism forged the dangerous weapon which socialism is using for the subversion of the existing social order.

4. Not only theoretically, but also practically, did liberalism pave the way for socialism. The way was smoothed chiefly by the introduction and enforcement of *unlimited industrial competition*, with all the liberties and privileges which it brings in its train. All protecting organizations which, in the course of time, had arisen to counteract the unlimited competition, whether in theory or in practice, were, in the name of freedom, violently suppressed. Even the laws against usury were abolished in the interest of freedom. Thus society was disintegrated, the weaker industries were isolated, and owing to un-

limited competition fell as victims to the superior power of capital. Moreover, since modern discoveries were made to serve merely the interests of capital, the solid middle class, which formed the strongest support of the existing social order, began more and more to disappear, and society was divided into two hostile classes—the wealthier bourgeoisie, on the one hand, with their implacable hatred against the Church and the nobility, with their insatiable avarice and reckless oppression of the laborers as of an inferior race; on the other hand, the huge masses of the poor, particularly laborers in factories, filled with hatred and revenge against their capitalistic oppressors. Thus a fertile soil was prepared for the social democracy. It needed only agitators to make the "disinherited" acquainted with the results of agnostic science, and to fling the firebrand of rebellion into the masses of the laborers—and there stood the social democracy full-fledged.

Moreover, liberalism endeavored to bring about a *centralization* in all departments of social economy, not only by utilizing modern discoveries in the field of industry, but still more by its control of education, and even of science, religion, and politics. Now, socialism, according to its very nature, aims at the greatest possible centralization. The means of production, the organization of labor, the distribution of produce, education, instruction—all is to be controlled by the state. The state takes upon itself the duties of the separate community, of the family, and of the individual. Hence Schäffle[1] logically concludes that "all centralization of the liberal state

[1] Quintessenz, p. 29.

favors socialism, and is congenial to it." But who has employed all means to centralize education, church government, marriage discipline, the care of the poor? Who has abolished the independence of municipalities, churches and religious orders, and given all into the hands of the state? This is the work of liberalism. Socialism is, therefore, nothing else than the logical development of the liberal idea of the state. The state is the source of all right, say the liberals; to this principle socialism can with perfect right appeal against liberalism and in favor of its own entire programme.

When we make liberalism responsible for these disagreeable facts, and impeach it with having produced and nourished socialism, would we thereby take up the defence of the latter? By no means. Our object is only to show that liberalism and socialism are closely related to each other, and that there is, therefore, no possibility of an efficient stand against socialism from the side of liberalism. Liberalism has but one means against socialism—the police. As soon as it tries other remedies its inconsistency and inefficiency against socialism become lamentably evident. He who will make an efficient stand against social democracy or socialism, and bring about a permanent betterment of our social conditions, must renounce liberalism and return to the platform of full and unrestricted Christianity.

CHAPTER III.

SOCIALISM IMPRACTICABLE.

SECTION I.

STATE OF THE QUESTION.

BEFORE we approach the refutation of the demands of socialism we must determine more accurately what we intend to prove.

1. When we call the socialistic demands impracticable or impossible, we would confine this statement to *modern democratic socialism.* We do not maintain that a social order, such as that devised by the socialists, involves a contradiction or is impracticable under all conditions. If men generally were entirely unselfish, industrious, obedient, filled with interest for the common weal, always ready to give everybody else the preference, and to choose for themselves the last and most disagreeable place—in short, if men were no longer men, as they are, but angels, a social order, according to the plan of the socialists, would not be impossible. But such a supposition cannot be made in favor of modern socialism.

2. Nay, we concede still more: we will not even

dispute that a state organization for the regulation and the distribution of all produce might be practicable under a strictly absolute government. If we could imagine an uneducated and undeveloped population, blindly following the dictates of a despotic monarch, we might conceive most of the demands of the socialists as practicable. In the ancient kingdom of the Incas many of the dreams of socialists were realized. But we must bear in mind that the Inca, begotten as he was of the sun, enjoyed divine honor and ruled with unlimited sway. Moreover, the state of civilization in the ancient kingdom of the Incas cannot be brought into comparison with the circumstances of modern civilized countries.

Socialism on a *democratic basis*, implying the absolute equality of all, is, at least in its entirety, a thing impossible. We say *in its entirety*, or in as much as it is conceived as one organized system ; for whether one or a few demands taken singly may be realized or not it is not our business to investigate, since this one or these few demands do not constitute socialism. For the rest, many of the socialistic demands are essentially connected with one another, so that one cannot exist without another. Such are, for instance, the possession of all means of production by the state, the systematic organization of production, and the distribution of produce according to some given common standard.

3. It is not our intention to maintain that socialism might not be realized *by force*. For what a violent revolution, which sweeps over a country like a hurricane, might bring about by the rule of terror goes beyond all human calculation. Even the incredible has been realized in the world's history.

We need only recall the English Revolution in the seventeenth century and the French Revolution in the eighteenth. What we would maintain is, that a *permanent* socialistic order is impossible, because it is in direct contradiction with the unchangeable inclinations and instincts of human nature.

4. In our refutation of socialism we shall confine ourselves to that form which goes under the name of *social democracy* or *collectivism*, which terms we take to be synonymous. This form of socialism comprises the most numerous and influential opponents of the existing social order, and in the minds of its defenders has most prospects of realization because it embodies the most rational and the most systematic plan of a social revolution. Besides, as we have seen, the programme of the social democrats of Germany and the collectivists of France very nearly coincide with the platforms of socialists in all other civilized countries. If, then, we have refuted this most popular and widespread form of socialism, the minor systems will of themselves fall to pieces.

5. Although we have already characterized socialism in its general outlines, yet it will be necessary here to enter more fully upon one of its features which is of the greatest importance for our present inquiry—*the appropriation of all means of production by the state.* It is erroneous to maintain that socialism would leave to separate communities or groups of laborers the possession of the means of labor and the organization of labor. That would be anarchism or communism, but not socialism in its genuine sense. The chief plank in the platform of modern socialism is the abolition of what it calls the anarchy of production, which it regards as the root of all

social evils, and the institution of a *systematic scheme* of production. But this end can be attained only if the entire state is the proprietor of all labor materials, the distributor of labor and of its proceeds. This scheme does not necessarily exclude the existence, in the socialistic order, of guilds or labor unions, communes, districts, etc., as members of its hierarchical order. But, in any case, a strict subordination of these various orders under one supreme state authority is regarded as essential. If the ownership of all labor means and, consequently, of the proceeds of labor, and the organization of labor itself would be left to separate communities, so that they could produce what they chose and as much as they pleased, our present competition would not be abolished, but only suspended for a short time. Instead of the private capitalists we would then have the communities as competitors. Therefore the anarchy of production would remain in full force; and a mistake committed in the system of production would only be the more detrimental, as it would not then affect private individuals only, but entire communities. One community could in that case, by intelligence, industry, and favorable circumstances, acquire immense riches, while another might fall into a state of utter wretchedness; and if every community should be industrially independent, and if communal property should exist, would every individual of the community then be free to leave his own community and betake himself to another? And if so, is another community obliged to receive and to tolerate strangers? If such liberty and independence should not exist, we would have a condition of perfect slavery; if it did exist, then a sys-

tematic control of labor would be impossible, since it could not be ascertained at any time what labor power would be at the disposal of the community. The better-conditioned communities would be deluged, while the less prosperous would be deserted.

Besides, the individual groups could not possibly each produce all its own necessaries, and would be, in consequence, obliged to enter into commercial relations with the neighboring communities or with foreign countries. Would this circumstance not lead to endless quarrels between communities, and produce a condition of universal warfare? Would not then the more powerful, that is, the richer, communities obtain political ascendency, and thus submit the democracy to their own aristocratic rule? Socialists sometimes speak of a union or *federation* of the communities as a remedy against such results. But if the several communities were industrially independent of one another, and possessed private property, such a federation would be short-lived. As in ancient Greece, the different communities would carry on a continual struggle for the supremacy; and finally the weaker communities would succumb to the stronger. And who should divide the produce among the different communities? Could such a division be made to the satisfaction of all?

An organization in which the several communities would be industrially independent of one another and would possess communal property, to our knowledge, has never been seriously thought of by modern socialists. And, in fact, the great leaders of socialism do not favor such a division of the national industrial system. According to their plans, the socialistic state is to take the place of our modern states;

and the place of monarchs and cabinets is to be occupied by a central committee, which is to direct the entire industrial system. True, Bebel and other socialists do not wish to call this democratic magistracy a "government," nor do they wish their organization to be called a "state." They believe that this central committee need only devise the mechanism of production and set it in motion, and the entire extensive machine will move spontaneously in the most harmonious order. But, though we admit the possibility of such an improbable fact, it remains true that socialists aim at a central organization of industry, corresponding, at least in extent, to our modern states. Hence Schäffle[1] seems truly to have characterized socialism in the following passage: "The only system of socialism imaginable is, and will continue to be, central organization, universal and exclusive collective production by the social democracy." "The socialistic system of production, we must always bear in mind, of absolute necessity forms one compact organization. How the form of this unity should be constituted, whether central or federal, absolute or democratic, . . . we shall not now undertake to discuss; . . . but the socialist must admit the necessity of one social system, an organization embracing the entire scheme of production. The anarchy of individual competition is, according to the premises of socialism, the source of all evil—of all fraud, disorder, inconsistency, usurpation, injustice in our modern industry. Then and not *till* then shall the socialistic state be a reality, when it tolerates only collective capital or property in the means of production."[2]

The following pen-picture of the socialistic state ready-made has been drawn by Franz Hitze: "The state is the only proprietor of all means of labor—of all lands, all manufactories, all means of transportation, all labor tools, all commerce, and perhaps also of all schools. At the head of the organization stands a perfect democratic government to be chosen by the people, say every two years; this government culminates in a committee, perhaps in a president.

[1] Aussichtslosigkeit der Socialdemocratie, p. 5.

[2] Quintessenz, p. 33.

The committee has the administration of the entire state; not only the political (legislative, executive, judicial), but also the control of the entire production, of the entire distribution, of the entire consumption (at least in its more general aspect, e.g., how much is to be deducted from consumption in favor of production, etc.). Although labor may be entrusted to the direction of subcommittees and departments, yet there must always be one comprehensive, supreme, and decisive authority. Under this central authority stand the provincial departments and communal bureaus, which discharge the same functions in behalf of their several districts as the central committee in behalf of the state; but all these must be subordinate to the supreme central board."[1]

Similarly, Adolf Wagner:[2] "If socialists would be consistent, they cannot leave to the several communities communal property either in capital or in land, and must have recourse to an effective coercive control by one supreme central authority for the estimation and application of the national capital. Capital as well as land must be the property of the entire state."

Rudolf Meyer[3] characterizes as an essential feature of socialism the demand that "production established on a social basis be regulated and controlled by the state."

Section II.

THE ORGANIZATION OF LABOR.

I. *Socialization of Productive Goods.*

SOCIALISTS would make all means of labor, not only the soil, but also manufactories, machinery, raw materials, work-tools, the exclusive property of

[1] Hitze, Kapital und Arbeit (1880), p. 286. Cf. Todt, Der Radikale deutsche Socialismus (1878), p. 218. Stern, Thesen, p. 8.

[2] Grundlegung, p. 614.

[3] Emancipationskampf des vierten Standes, p. 78.

the entire community. One of their chief demands is "the conversion of all labor materials into the common property of society."[1] Only consumable articles or such as are immediately destined for use shall, as the remuneration for labor performed, become private property. But here a grave misgiving at once presents itself. What are *productive* goods and what are *consumable* goods? Both these kinds of goods may well be distinguished in the mind. But as soon as we put the question in the concrete, whether this or that article is productive or only consumable, the difficulty becomes manifest. Most objects may be productive and useful or consumable, according to the end for which the possessor wishes to employ them. A garden, for instance, is a useful object; it yields the possessor fruits, affords him the facility of taking exercise and fresh air and enjoying the beauty and fragrance of its flowers and the shade of its trees; but the fruits and vegetables which it produces may also be sent to the market either in their primitive state or prepared and preserved, and thus rendered of still higher value. The same may be said of a house, a horse, a carriage, or of any article of furniture or of domestic use. Needles and thread and sewing-machines are articles of immediate use in a family; but they may also be used by the tailor or dress-maker to make clothes for others, and thus they become productive.[2]

Now, are all those articles of use to become common property? If so, every individual would be dependent upon the community even in the most

[1] Gotha programme (p. 21); Erfurt programme (p. 24).

[2] Cf. Leroy-Beaulieu, Le Collectivisme, p. 13, sq.

trivial matters. Domestic life with mutual services would be a thing impossible. The only way out of the difficulty would be that such objects of use which might be also serviceable for production would be left to individuals, with a legal injunction not to employ them for productive purposes, but only for their own private use. Such an arrangement, however, would necessarily lead to most extensive and minute police supervision, and give occasion to endless fraud. Let us suppose, for instance, that an orchard is given to the father of a family for his own use, with the strict injunction not to use the fruit for any other purpose, but to deliver the surplus to the public magazines. How much of the fruit would be delivered to the community? Would the possessor in that case deal economically with the produce of his garden? Would he keep it in good condition and endeavor to improve it? Would he not be inclined secretly to donate or to sell what he could not use for himself?

Paulsen[1] is of opinion that not only furniture, works of art, ornaments, and books, but also houses and gardens, might remain private property, "with all the effects peculiar to private ownership—with the right to bequeath and to donate, to consume and to preserve, to sell and to lend them." However, this would manifestly demolish the entire system of socialism. This freedom would enable private individuals to acquire extensive property by the purchase, inheritance, or donation of houses, gardens, and other rentable property, and finally to come to such wealth and independence as to live on their income—which is hardly consistent with the socialistic scheme. A socialist might urge in favor of Paulsen's theory that houses, gardens, etc., might be safely allowed to pass into private hands, because in a

[1] System der Ethik, p. 716.

system in which all parties are daily employed in production and are forced to earn the necessaries of life no one would care for further income. However, this supposition is untrue. Wealth would also in a socialistic state lead to power and influence, and would therefore not be looked upon with indifference. And besides, what motives could influence a man to work if he could live on his income? Would it not be necessary, then, to use violent measures in order to make him work? But would not such force bring about the most unbearable slavery? If socialism would pretend to succeed, it cannot be satisfied with half-measures; it must remain consistent in its demands.

II. *Mode of Determining the Social Demand.*

Let us suppose for the moment that the distinction between consumable and productive goods were sufficiently established, and that all means of production were "socialized," or placed in the possession of the community at large. Now it remains to regulate the national production—a function which the socialistic programme calls the "social regulation of the collective labor." But such a regulation can be effected only after the social demand has been estimated; for the satisfaction of the social demand is the object and, at the same time, the standard by which the extent of production is to be determined. The social demand must therefore be established by daily, weekly, monthly, or yearly statistical estimates.

Some one may think perhaps that such estimates would be superfluous; that we might simply take the present rate of consumption as the basis of the socialistic production. But granting even that the present rate of consumption could be statistically established in detail, which, however, is hardly pos-

sible, it would by no means serve as the standard of production in a socialistic state, since it is the result of the present state of property and production, which is totally different from the socialistic state. For it supposes, on the one hand, large incomes on the side of capital and, on the other hand, small incomes on the side of labor; it supposes particularly the wage or service system, and is based on the condition of private production. Therefore, as Adolf Wagner [1] justly remarks: "The consumption of our day is the result of the present distribution of income and property, and of private rents arising from real estate and capital. A statistic calculation, therefore, based upon the present conditions would be insufficient." Much less can we suppose that the supreme authority in the socialistic state would simply fix the demand in regard to quality and quantity of the products by peremptory *order*, and thus determine the amount and kind of production. Such an action would certainly be possible; but, to say nothing of the fact that it would be inconsistent with the democratic organization of socialism, it would be in itself unmitigated tyranny; for freedom consists, above all things, in the liberty to determine of one's self the conditions of one's life in regard to food, clothing, housing, recreation, means of mental improvement, etc. He who cannot use his free choice in these matters, but must follow the dictates of higher authority, is a slave though he may be called a freeman. Freedom in the determination of one's own wants is also the necessary condition of all progress and culture.

[1] Grundlegung, p. 617.

Hence Schäffle[1] himself remarks: "The liberty to determine one's own wants is certainly the first requisite of all freedom. If the means of life and culture were determined by some external force, according to a certain standard, no one could live and develop according to his own individual character. The very life's support of freedom would perish. The question is, therefore, whether socialism destroys the individual freedom to determine personal wants or not. If it does, it is opposed to freedom, contrary to all individuality, and therefore against morality, and without any prospect or possibility at any time to be reconciled with the indestructible instincts of man."

Let us suppose, then, that it was theoretically left to the choice of each to determine his own demands —we say *theoretically*, for practically this freedom would be limited by want of sufficient income. Also the factory laborer of to-day is theoretically free to determine his own wants; but practically this freedom is greatly limited by his income. This would be the case also in the socialistic state; for no one would have any other income than the proceeds of his labor. The socialists, it is true, do not fail to hold out grand prospects to the laborer. J. Stern[2] assures us that in the socialistic state "all would possess all things in abundance, to their heart's content," and characterizes as "Philistines" those who refuse to give him credence. However, we are not inclined to believe in such a multiplication of loaves and fishes. But we shall have occasion hereafter to submit this point to a fuller examination. Yet the chief representatives of socialism themselves seem to entertain some misgiving in regard to such a miracle. Bebel,[3] at least, frankly

[1] Quintessenz, p. 23.
[2] Thesen, p. 28.
[3] Unsere Ziele, p. 30.

confesses that "luxury will cease;" but he adds, "poverty and starvation also." When all shall have nearly the same income, it is greatly to be feared that the pittance will turn out very meagre. In another passage Bebel[1] says that the determination of the demands will be an *easy* matter, "because objects of luxury which are nowadays purchased only by the minority will come into disuse," and "the community will have to decide in how far demands are to be satisfied by new productions."

By these words are sufficiently implied, consistently with the principles of socialism, that each one will obtain only those necessaries which the community at large will agree to produce. Production depends in its quantity and quality upon the articles in demand. New demands also require new means of production. Will every one, then, be at liberty to order new objects for his own use which require new industrial arrangements, and consequently involve an increase of the common labor? But if the community at large or its representatives should have first to decide whether the wishes of individual members should be gratified or not, the freedom of determining the demands is thereby all but destroyed.

Still more oppressive than this restriction of personal freedom would be the burden imposed upon every family—for we suppose in the mean time that in the socialistic state the family would still continue to exist—to manifest all its wants in advance and have them registered by the officials appointed for this purpose. In order to know what and how much

[1] Unsere Ziele, p. 31.

of every commodity should be produced, and in order to make out the plan of production, it must first be ascertained what each one needs and demands. Men and women, therefore, must report all their wants and wishes, small as well as great, to the respective officials at the bureau of consumption, in order that they may, after the regular lapse of time, be able to draw the desired articles from the public magazines on presenting their labor schedules. Not to make ridiculous suppositions in reference to the socialistic state, we shall admit that a certain supply of the more ordinary articles of daily use is kept on hand, so that each one can on his labor certificate draw the ordinary necessaries from the public stores. This scheme, however, could be employed only in regard to the most common articles of daily use. Now, if our present system of production, which always endeavors to be ready to meet all demands, cannot have sufficient supplies of all articles in demand, at all times and in all places, this would be all the more impossible in the socialistic state; or such a state would necessarily fall into the same error of which it accuses our present system of production—that is, it would produce by haphazard a huge quantity of goods which would lie idle and unconsumed in the state or communal storehouse.

J. Stern, with surprising naïveté, rates Schäffle as not being capable of rightly imagining the socialistic commonwealth, because the latter is of opinion that in the socialistic state all labor and all consumption must be determined by a standard of *time*, and that the social distribution of articles of use is to be made by means of checks. We are of opinion, however, that Schäffle has conceived more correctly of socialism than did J. Stern. Schäffle's opinion is the logi-

cal outcome of the socialistic principle that labor is the only source of value and wealth, and that each one is to receive the full proceeds of his labor. The exposition of Stern is simply astonishing when he comes to describe the distribution of produce. Every one who can show that he has performed a certain amount of labor has the most unlimited right to any species of consumable goods in any quantity he may choose to fix. He draws his clothing from the public stores, he dines at the public hotel on what he pleases; or, if he prefers, he may dine at home in a highly comfortable residence, which stands in communication with the public hotels (by telephone, pneumatic tube, and by whatever other inventions may be made in the mean time), whence he may in the most convenient way [per tube ?] order his meals, just as he pleases; or, if he prefers, he may have them prepared at home [by whom ?]; or he may prepare them himself.[1]

Such a description may, in fact, gladden the heart of a credulous socialist. With a minimum of work-time he may enjoy himself to the full. He may imagine fountains of sack, champagne, Bavarian beer, and cognac, from which every working-man may quench his thirst at pleasure. He may picture to himself tables laden with the most delicate viands. He may imagine with what contempt he will look back upon the days of brown bread and potatoes. Having eaten and drunk to his heart's content, the working-man will go to the theatre or concert, or will drive out in a fine equipage until, late at evening, tired of enjoyment, he will retire to rest upon his soft couch. Stern, however, has forgotten one thing. Who shall procure and prepare all these dainties? Who shall wait upon his socialistic lordship? Who shall perform for him in the theatres and concerts? Who shall saddle or span his steeds, and act as his groom? Stern, it is true, revels in the prospects of great inventions in the field of electricity. But does he really imagine that electricity will be made so serviceable as finally to prepare and serve his dinner to the socialist, to fit out his residence for him, and to give him a theatrical performance? And then, how can all these good things be procured and prepared in

[1] Thesen, pp. 12, 13.

such quantities that each one with the minimum of labor may obtain the maximum of enjoyment? It is truly amazing how Stern rehearses all these foolish dreams with such an air of earnestness. And yet, if any one refuses him credence he does not hesitate to call him a Philistine—which is, to say the least, a very cheap kind of argumentation.

It remains, therefore, that every family is obliged to report all its necessities—if we except the most common objects of daily use—to the officials at the proper bureaus. Yet this cannot be supposed to be a light burden. Now every one is at liberty to supply all his own wants at pleasure, either by his own labor or by purchase, when and where and from whomsoever he pleases, whether at home or abroad. Thus he is enabled to conceal the secrets of his household from the public gaze. Even business people, laborers, physicians, druggists, etc., are bound to secrecy, at least in their own interests. In the socialistic state, however, every one could, by examining the public registers, pry into the deepest secrets of every household. For in the socialistic state there would be no professions, bound to secrecy by their own interests as now, and the public registers would be open to the gaze and inspection of the sovereign people.

Besides, we cannot overlook the fact that the socialistic system would require a huge amount of clerical work to determine the demands of an extensive commonwealth. Socialists, however, point to our modern syndicates, corporations, state industries, etc., to show how easy it would be to determine the wants of a nation. But they overlook the immense difference between a single comparatively small company, established for a limited purpose, and an

entire commonwealth made up of several millions of human beings; for, as Stern[1] rightly remarks, socialism can be actuated only on a large scale. How much writing, for instance, does a single census cost? How much labor is expended on making out the annual estimates of a nation? And yet how simple are these estimates compared with the consumption of the individuals of an entire nation! Consider, moreover, the thousands of articles of daily use, great and small, required for the physical and intellectual life of a nation—for clothing, food, housing, recreation, education, commercial intercourse—not of a small community, but of a nation of many millions; for no one would be allowed to produce anything for himself. Would that not require an overwhelming amount of statistic labor, and a huge army of bureau officials? And would not such a complicated system of bureaucracy be subject to the greatest blunders, which perhaps would prove fatal to the production and to the existence of an entire nation? And when we consider, moreover, that these legions of officials would be bound by no private interest to the faithful administration of their office, could we expect a statistical result which might serve as a safe basis for production?

III. *Division of the Labor Forces.*

Let us suppose that the demands have been determined by the central bureau on the basis of the statistics received from the several communities or provinces. Now comes the task of organizing the national labor, or, as the Gotha programme has it, of

[1] Thesen, p. 50.

"regulating the entire labor according to a social method," i.e., in the words of the Erfurt programme, "for and by society." For this purpose a division of the labor forces is necessary, or at least an accurate knowledge is required of the number, ability, and strength of the labor forces of which each community or district can dispose. For it is not possible to impose upon all provinces and districts the same amount of labor without any regard to the forces at their disposal. It may not be necessary that the central committee or "council of production" distribute the labor among the individuals of the state. That task may be left to the several communities. But it must necessarily determine what and how much each district has to produce and deliver to the community. But this task supposes an accurate knowledge of the working forces at the disposal of the several communities.

We shall suppose, however, that together with the statistics of demand also an accurate estimate of the number of laborers and the efficiency of the labor forces of the different districts has been given. Here a new difficulty arises. In order to distribute their quantity of labor to each district or community, it is not sufficient to know the forces on hand at the time the division is made. But it must also be settled that all labor hands are to remain, at least for a certain time, say a year, in the same place. The question then arises whether in this socialistic state the present freedom of migration should be granted or not. Bebel,[1] on his part, advocates such freedom, but how is it possible to

[1] Die Frau, p. 188.

organize labor if we suppose a constantly floating population? How can a community produce a certain amount of work if perhaps within the time specified for the performance of their task a large number of the labor hands emigrate to other communities? If, therefore, a systematic plan of production is to be put in force the population must be constrained to remain at least for a time in a certain place, so that during this time the migration to another community can be effected at most with the permission of the authorities.

But even this measure does not remove the difficulty. What would be the result if such a migration from one place to another would be permitted? We shall suppose that no one is constrained by law to settle in any particular place, but that each one is left free to choose the place where he wishes to settle; for this is an essential requirement of freedom. Now, what would be the result if in the socialistic state such freedom of migration were permitted? We have reason to fear that roaming propensities, and what is vulgarly called tramping, would become an epidemic in the socialistic state. Nowadays the greater number at least of those who are not utterly bereft of property are bound *in their own interest* to choose a fixed residence, either permanently or at least for some time; and even those who have no property must choose their domicile in the place where they have a prospect of earning their living. These motives, however, would not exist in the socialistic state; for each member would know full well that every part of the country, whether north, south, east, or west, would be equally his home; that he would have the

same rights everywhere, and the same claims to work and support.

Nor can it be answered that regard for children, for the sick and aged, would induce the socialistic citizen to choose a permanent residence; for we must bear in mind that the care of children, of the aged and infirm, would be left to the state; and consequently it could not be any impediment to emigration. Or would the love of home, perhaps, attach the socialist to his native soil? We say the love of home in the stricter sense; for in the socialistic state there would be no love of country in a wider sense, as the socialist would be alike in his own country in all places. His country is not his community, or any fixed place, but at most the entire state. Every socialist would have in every community in the great commonwealth the same right; in his birthplace he would have no more rights than in any other part. Why, then, should he feel himself permanently attached to his birthplace? The foundation of the love of our birthplace is based on the right of property. The love of the place of his birth is generally not deeply rooted in the penniless beggar; his patriotism extends only to the confines of that place which affords him shelter and support. Not until a family has long lived and labored in the same place, until it has a part of its history connected with the place, until it has formed manifold ties of kindred and friendship, does it become attached to the place of its residence. But all this supposes private property, and, as a rule, property in land—at least the possession of a house or of a little holding, and a roof which one may call his own. But all these elements

are wanting in the socialistic state, in which every foot of the soil is equally the property of all its inhabitants. Therefore we are not surprised to hear socialists repeatedly characterizing patriotism as "prejudice" or even as "folly." [1]

IV. *Distribution of Labor. Vocations.*

After the demands have been determined and the labor forces of each community have been ascertained, it remains for the central bureau to distribute their quantum of labor to the different workmen and workwomen. The committee has to determine who is to be employed in agriculture, industry, mining; who in the distribution of produce; who is to be entrusted with its transportation, etc. It is a matter of indifference whether the communal committee determine the position which each one should occupy in the mechanism of production, or whether the position of each is to be assigned him by the authorities of the special departments of industry. In any case, the central committee must determine to which department of industry each one is to be ascribed. Here again it must evidently be supposed that the heads of the departments of production have at their disposal a permanent population.

Can the distribution of the various works be brought about on any other plan? True, some socialistic enthusiasts would leave the choice of an occupation at the pleasure of each individual: thus at the beginning of the movement Charles Fourier,

[1] Cf. Meyer, Der Emancipationskampf, vol. ii. p. 116.

and recently Bebel[1] and Stern.[2] "Each one," says Bebel, "determines for himself in what occupation he wishes to be employed; the great variety of the various branches of labor will satisfy the most various tastes. . . . The different branches and groups of labor will choose their own superintendents to direct their various departments. These will be no taskmasters like most of our present labor inspectors and foremen: they will be comrades, with this difference only, that they exercise an administrative instead of a productive function." The socialistic body can at pleasure devote itself "at one season of the year to agricultural, at another to industrial production."[3] Not only in regard to industrial, but also in regard to scientific and artistic studies shall every one have occasion for suitable variety.[4]

Yet all this is a visionary dream. If the quality of occupation is left to the choice of each, all will flock to the easiest, pleasantest, and most honorable employments. The industries are naturally very unequal, and even socialism cannot remove this inequality. To be a director or a member of the supreme council of production is an easier occupation than that of a fireman, or of a collier, or of a laborer in a chemical factory, who has to pass his hours in broiling heat and fetid air; the office of a committeeman would be more pleasant than that of the individual who would be deputed to clean the streets and sewers of the cities. Socialists will use much printer's ink before they can print out of the world the fact that many occupations in the social-

[1] Die Frau, p. 154.
[2] Thesen, p. 37, sq.
[3] Die Frau, p. 188.
[4] Ibid., p. 160.

istic state would be irksome, laborious, dangerous, and repulsive. If the choice were left to individuals certainly sufficient forces would not be found for the performance of such disagreeable work.

Bebel, however, tries to find a way out of the difficulty. He is of opinion that street-cleaning, washing, and other disagreeable kinds of work would in the socialistic state be performed by mechanical means, so that these occupations would cease to be disagreeable.[1] But even though we should make the greatest allowances for modern and future inventions, yet it would be puerile to imagine that all the disagreeable features of labor could be removed by machinery. There would still remain much disagreeable work, which could be effected only by immediate personal action. Besides, such machines must be tended and directed. Does Bebel imagine that the socialists could bring machinery to such perfection that it would be necessary only to let a machine down a shaft in order to hoist it laden with coal? Experience teaches that industrial progress has rather multiplied than diminished disagreeable occupations. Though some kinds of distasteful work are nowadays performed by machinery, other still more loathsome ones have been created in their stead. We have only to recall the number of chemical factories which are a standing nuisance not only to the laboring men, but also to whole cities and country places for miles around. Besides, we must bear in mind that it is a point of the socialistic programme to utilize for the benefit of society all manner of garbage and refuse, which will certainly

[1] Cf. Stern, Thesen, p. 38.

afford no very pleasant occupation for the laborer of the future.

Unless we admit, then, that in the state of the future unselfishness, self-devotion, and thirst for self-abasement and suffering shall become general, nothing else remains for us than to conclude that, finally, the influence of authority, or the vote of the majority, must force the laborer to condescend to these disagreeable and humiliating avocations. But such interposition of authority or of the popular vote would evidently take away all freedom of choice, and be a source of endless complaint and discontent. And yet, according to the socialistic programme, there should be "equality of rights" and "equality in the conditions of life." But is it consistent with this equality, either by command of authority or by popular vote, to condemn one man rather than another to such despicable and disagreeable employments?

V. *Some Unsatisfactory Solutions.*

Freedom in the choice of a vocation or state of life is such an essential constituent of human liberty that without it life is sheer slavery. It is natural, therefore, that socialists and their advocates should have sought out some means of securing this freedom in the socialistic system, despite its strictly methodic arrangement. Schäffle is of opinion that by a certain regulative system freedom in the choice of a state might be made compatible with the social organization of labor. He thinks that committees, appointed for this purpose, could by the reduction of pay stop the immoderate demand for certain

professions, and, on the other hand, by raising the pay for other departments of labor attract larger numbers of aspirants to the less desirable occupations. This proposition, however, does not seem to suit the socialistic system; for it supposes that the pay for certain kinds of labor could be raised and lowered at pleasure, as far as this would be serviceable to the labor organization. By such a measure the socialistic theory of value would be thrown overboard; for the value of produce would no longer depend on the necessary time consumed in producing it, but on external circumstances—from the greater demand, or from the greater extent of social wants. But would laborers tamely submit to the reduction of their wages because perhaps in another department of industry there is a lack of labor forces? This solution of the problem would lead to the result that the lowest and most disagreeable occupation, in which the least intellectual labor is required, would be paid best of all, and that the pay would diminish in proportion as the labor would ascend in the scale of intellectuality and appreciation; for naturally the rush towards the higher and more interesting kinds of labor would continue. Such treatment of the laborer would not only be unjust, but would crush every aspiration to higher culture and higher social standing.

Edward Bellamy,[1] in the fiction entitled "Looking Backward," gives a most glowing description of the future socialistic state, and endeavors to represent it in all respects as practicable. He tries to meet our difficulty by the regulation of the labor-time. If the

[1] Looking Backward, chap. vii.

number of candidates for any one calling should be too great and for another too small, the labor-time would be lengthened for the one and shortened for the other. This, he thinks, would be a sufficient means of reducing, on the one side, the number of those who aspire to a higher calling, and, on the other side, of increasing the number of those who would be willing to be employed in less honorable labor or professions. But if this should prove unsuccessful, and too few laborers were found for any department of industry, it would be sufficient, he thinks, for the authorities to declare that such neglected labor would be connected with special honor, and that those who would engage in it would merit the gratitude of the entire nation. For the youth of such a socialistic nation, he thinks, would be very ambitious, and would not allow such an occasion of gratifying their ambition to go unused. If, on the other hand, the rush of laborers to any department of industry were too great, those only should be chosen who would distinguish themselves in that special industry.

This theory is characteristic of Bellamy's treatment of the social question. He imagines humanity almost free from all those passions and shortcomings to which the children of Adam are now subject—a generation full of zeal and devotion to the common weal. But, we ask, are those human beings whom we meet in social life really such a generation of angels? Bellamy himself shows that they are not when he depicts in the most exaggerated colors the egotism of the present generation. We must deal with men as they are and shall continue to be; and for such men Bellamy's system has no use. Does

Bellamy imagine that those who have been long employed in some work or profession will tamely submit to have the labor-time lengthened indefinitely, simply because there are many candidates for that kind of labor? And could a varying labor-time, suited to the different industries, be thus established by government? The demand for certain kinds of labor is not unchangeable, but may vary according to the varying inclinations of men, or according to the circumstances of time and place. It is impossible by the regulation of the labor-time to determine the number of laborers which are required to produce the necessaries of an entire nation without committing enormous blunders, and thus creating dissatisfaction. This policy would also have the necessary result of multiplying the number of laborers employed in the lowest and most disagreeable kinds of labor. Let us consider the matter in the concrete. Mining, for instance, is much more irksome, disagreeable, and dangerous than the occupation of a gardener, an overseer, or an artist. In order, therefore, to obtain a sufficient number of workmen it would be necessary to reduce the labor-time of miners to a minimum. What would be the result? The number of miners would have to be increased in proportion, if raw materials, coal, etc., should be forthcoming in sufficient quantities. And what we say of miners applies also to all inferior and undesirable kinds of work—for instance, street-cleaning, stable-tending, chimney-sweeping. The number of laborers in all those lower employments would have to be increased considerably to make up for the shortness of the labor-time by the increase of labor-power. Thus labor forces would be

withdrawn from the higher and more skilled occupations, and the entire tendency of society would be backward and downward. The more degrading and disagreeable any kind of labor would be the more laborers it would employ. Besides, according to Bellamy, all members of the social body should have a share in the national product, so that a stable-boy by fewer hours' work could earn as much as an artist, a physician, or a lawyer, who would have to labor the livelong day.

Bebel fancies he has found a way out of the difficulty. In the first place, he has the most unlimited confidence in the self-sacrifice of the laborers of the future, who at the beck of their directors will always be found ready voluntarily to fill all the breaches that may be thrown open. If this unselfish spirit, however, should not suffice, all in their turn must undertake the disagreeable works; for "there will be no human respect and no stupid contempt of useful labor."[1] Nay, more; he is of opinion that the superior education of future society will effect that finally every laborer, in his turn, will be able to undertake all the functions of labor. "It is not at all improbable that as the organization progresses and the thorough education of all members of the social body will advance, the different functions of labor shall simply become alternate—that, at stated intervals, according to a fixed routine, all members of a certain department, without distinction of sex, shall undertake all functions."[2] Bebel maintains the possibility of such a routine at the outset only for the various functions within

[1] Die Frau, p. 165. [2] Ibid., p. 154.

the same department of production. But at a later stage of the development of his subject he gives this routine system a much wider application. In the socialistic state the greatest regard will be had for the natural craving of man for variety; for all will have an opportunity to perfect themselves in all the branches of industry. "There will be no lack of time to acquire great facility and practice in the various branches of industry. Large, comfortable, and perfectly equipped workshops will facilitate for all, young and old, the learning of all trades, and will introduce them to their practice as it were in play. Chemical and physical laboratories, fully answering the demands of science, will be at hand, and teachers in great abundance. Then it will be manifest what a world of force and power was suppressed by the capitalistic system of production, or how these forces and powers were at least crippled in their development."[1]

These conclusions of Bebel are most logical, and by this very fact they strikingly illustrate the absurdity of socialism. To all disagreeable employments, therefore, for which laborers do not present themselves voluntarily every member of society will have to submit in his turn. Every one must in his turn be street-cleaner, chimney-sweep, stable-boy, etc. Let us picture to ourselves Messrs. Bebel and Liebknecht, "without any human respect," when duty calls them, submitting themselves to these disagreeable avocations, which no other member of the social body volunteers to undertake. What would the gentlemen then say of the freedom left to man

[1] Die Frau, p. 160.

in such a system? When Bebel assures us that in the society of the future education, and particularly technical training, would fit every member of the social body for all functions and all industries, his statement can hardly be said to deserve a refutation. Let us only imagine what such industrial and technical ability supposes. Every individual in his turn undertakes all social functions; for instance, in a factory he is director, foreman, fireman, book-keeper, a simple laborer, and tender; then he turns to some other branch of industry or social calling—becomes editor, compositor, telegrapher, painter, architect, actor, farmer, gardener, astronomer, professor, chemist, druggist. With such a programme, is any thorough knowledge of anything possible?

Paulsen[1] justly characterizes the state of the future. "In the society of the future," he says, "the self-same individual will be letter-carrier to-day; to-morrow he must perform the duties of a post-office clerk; on the third day he must act as postmaster-general—but why use a title?—in short he must undertake all that business which at present the director of the national post-office has in hand—he must prepare programmes for international post-office congresses, etc.; and on the fourth day he must again return to the counter; on the fifth he condescends to be letter-carrier once more, but this time not in the metropolis, but in some out-of-the-way place; for it is but meet that the sweets of city life should fall to the lot of all in their turn. Thus it would be also in the railroad department, in the mining and in the military department, and in every common factory. To-day the member of the socialistic state descends into the bowels of the earth as a collier, or hammers at the anvil, or punches tickets; to-morrow he wields the quill, balances accounts, makes chemical experiments, draughts designs for

[1] System der Ethik, p. 738.

machines, or issues general edicts on the quantity and quality of the social production, etc. In the naval department there would be a similar variety: the office of captain would fall to the lot of all in turn, as also that of steersman, of machinist, of cook, etc. And thus also in the department of state; the various officials would exchange functions: each one would in his turn be legislator, judge, commander-in-chief of the army, and chief of police. But I have forgotten where I was: in the state of the future there will be no more wars, and no more thieves, and falsifiers, and idlers, and tramps; consequently there will be no more judges and soldiers necessary. Nor will there be any need of laws, or of a state at all, in the land of Utopia, in which the wolves will play with the lambs on the pasture and eat grass; when the ocean will be filled with lemonade and ships will be drawn by tame whales; where envy, hatred, tyranny, ambition, indolence, folly, and vanity will no longer exist; where there will be only wise and good men—in the millennium, for which it will not be necessary to devise laws and ordinances. In this ideal state benevolence alone shall reign supreme.

"There can be no serious thought of appointing or dismissing by ballot the directors who are to superintend the work of the community according to the necessity and according to the public opinion of the voters. Every one can easily picture to himself the results of such elections if they were to be carried out in the entire social body: the party strifes, quarrels, contentions, cheating, public denunciation, which would then ensue even in the smallest circles—even in the supposition that there would be no diversity of material interests and no ill-will—from the difference of opinion on points of mere convenience, usefulness, and possibility alone."

VI. *Refutation of an Objection.*

When it is objected to socialists that they will finally by the ruling of authority have individuals constrained to perform that work which the com-

mon good demands, and that thus they take away all freedom in the choice of employment, they raise the contrary objection that now there is no freedom in the choice of a vocation—that most people are forced by necessity to seize upon the first employment which offers itself to them. Yet this objection of socialists is one-sided and exaggerated. It is not true that most people are not free to choose their vocation or employment. The great mass of the population has undoubtedly considerable freedom in this regard. There are comparatively few who are not free, on leaving school, to choose from a great variety of occupations. An unlimited freedom in the choice of a vocation does not exist and has never existed; nor is such freedom in the interest of society; for it is rather an advantage to society if certain callings have permanence and constancy and are generally filled by the same classes. A family in which a certain business or trade has been traditionally handed down from generation to generation has generally great advantages from a moral and industrial standpoint over a family or individual who is new in such trade or business. That at present there are many cases in which, owing to extreme poverty, the choice of a state in life is almost illusory we shall willingly grant; but this circumstance arises from the present unlimited competition, and from the disintegration of social life resulting therefrom—which we do not by any means undertake to defend. From this fact, therefore, nothing can be concluded in favor of socialism.

Finally—and that is the chief point—the necessity which binds men to a certain kind of work in the present state of society is only a moral one,

which is independent of the will of others, while in the socialistic state this necessity would emanate from the ordination of the social authority. Now it is *the interest of the individual* which forces him to embrace a certain profession and rightly to prepare himself for the duties connected with it. In consequence of this moral necessity the distribution of the various avocations of life is made without law or precept. Even the lowest and most disagreeable employments generally find a sufficient number of candidates, and commonly those who are employed in them are satisfied with their avocation as long as it yields them a sufficient means of subsistence. The discontent so common among laborers in our time is not with labor itself, but with excessive labor and insufficient pay. If employers would better the condition of the laborer, contentment and satisfaction with their condition would soon return to them if they were not disturbed by the visionary theories of social agitators. But if laborers are made to believe that all men have equal rights and should enjoy equal advantages in life, it will be found impossible to reconcile them with their condition. This same imaginary claim to absolute equality will prove the death-blow of socialism itself, for the simple reason that it aspires to an utter impossibility.

VII. *Impossibility of the Social Organization of Labor.*

Another flaw in the socialistic system is the tacit supposition that all kinds of work and all services for the benefit of society may be reduced to one com-

prehensive labor system. This supposition is erroneous. There will be always a large number of personal services which by their very nature cannot be brought into any system, unless the world is to be governed by strict military rule. Such are, for instance, all those services which immediately regard the care of the body—food, clothing, cleanliness, cooking, housekeeping, washing, mending, etc. Shall every one bring his coat to the "social" tailor to be mended? Must every one present himself to the state's barber and hair-dresser for his toilet? Must every one consign his linens to the public laundries? We must bear in mind that the relation between masters and servants, and, in short, the entire wage system, will cease to exist in those days. And if in a family, to crown the difficulty, the housewife is sick or otherwise unfit for work, or happens to die, do the socialists imagine that her services may be substituted in the state of the future by mechanical means? In answer to this difficulty they point to our present system of boarding-houses and hotels, where all parties at all times can be served according to their wishes, and lack no earthly comforts. Why, then, they say, could not all such personal services be rendered in the socialistic state by means of public kitchens and dining-halls, by public laundries and workshops, on a large scale? To say nothing of the disintegration of family life which would arise from such a public boarding system, would it not be downright slavery if every one were altogether dependent upon public institutions for the satisfaction of his personal wants? Besides, we can hardly believe that such public boarding institutions, laundries, etc., would give general satisfaction. Our

present hotel and boarding system is conducted on quite a different principle. It consists of private institutions, whose proprietors or directors have the greatest interest to attract guests and to satisfy, as far as possible, all their reasonable wishes; for if the guests are dissatisfied with the treatment accorded them and the prices they pay, they will go elsewhere, and thus the hotel-keeper or landlord will lose his customers, and his competitors will profit by his loss.

The socialistic eating-houses, on the contrary, would be public institutions conducted by public officials, who would draw their necessaries from the public magazines, and would have no competition to fear. Would such public state cooks, butlers, waiters, etc., be as eager to satisfy their guests as the officials of our private hotels? We doubt it very much. The "social" cook or waiter would be independent of his guests, and if the latter were dissatisfied with his services he would have nothing to lose thereby. Nay, we fear that such socialistic institutions would be far behind our military kitchens. Let us suppose, moreover, that all these officials would have to change their offices from time to time, so that no one would understand anything thoroughly—that he who is cook to-day should be waiter to-morrow, and laundry-man next day, and then butler, and finally return again to the kitchen, but only for so long a time as either his own caprice or public authority would keep him in that office. But enough of absurdity.

This difficulty did not escape the notice of Schäffle. He is of opinion that socialists could leave such personal services to private enterprise. Such a policy, however, would

leave a wide gap in the principles of socialism, which would finally remove every form of wage labor. If socialists would leave personal services to private enterprise they must tolerate at least the existence of paid servants. Thus also many hands would be withdrawn from the national production; for persons who would devote themselves to the performance of such private services could not be expected at the same time to take part in the social industry. Besides, the equality of the conditions of life would be destroyed if private services were permitted; for thus it would be possible for some such servants, by superior ability, favorable circumstances, or ingenuity, to procure a large income, while another private servant would either have a miserable existence or be constrained to return to the common ranks of producers. In another place, however, Schäffle[1] says that private enterprise would be altogether excluded in the socialistic commonwealth, and that all those laborers who would not take an immediate part in the social production, as artists, for instance, would receive a public salary. We may readily grant that the income arising from such personal services would never attain such dimensions as that arising from the modern accumulations of capital; yet the general principle of socialism—that only public labor paid by the state is to be tolerated—would thus be subverted.

Section III.

PROFIT AND PROGRESS IN SOCIALISM.

I. *Socialistic Dreams.*

THE ringleaders of the socialists promise their followers a golden age. Little work and much enjoyment—that is the gist of socialism. This is manifest particularly from Bebel's published works.

If we are to believe this popular leader, labor in the socialistic state, owing to its great variety and the modern and

[1] Quintessenz, p. 3.

future perfection of mechanical inventions, will be mere amusement. Most kinds of labor will be performed, as it were, "in play." Besides, labor, owing to the systematic regulations and the wise utilization of all means of production, will be so productive that between two and three hours' work per day will suffice for the perfect satisfaction of all human wants. Egotism and the interest for the common weal will be in harmony; nay, these motives will exactly coincide with each other in the socialistic organization.[1] There shall be no more idlers. The moral atmosphere itself will incite every individual to "distinguish himself before all others."[2] An unheard-of "world of forces and possibilities," which have been suppressed by the capitalistic system of production, will be made free.[3] There will be no more political crimes or other violations of law.[4] Barracks and other military institutions, court-houses, city-halls, prisons, will then have a better use. The nations will no longer look upon each other as enemies, but as "brothers." The age of "everlasting peace" will come. The weapons of war will be stored up in the museums of antiquities. Then the nations shall advance to ever higher culture and civilization.

Most particularly in those days, by means of irrigation, draining of marshes and moors, and by superior means of communication, agriculture will change the entire land into huge gardens, and thus entice the people from the cities into the country. As in the cities, so also in the country there will be museums, theatres, concert-halls, play-houses, hotels, reading-rooms, libraries, business offices, institutions of learning, parks, promenades, public baths, scientific laboratories, hospitals, etc.[5]

In the socialistic state all the faculties of man will be developed harmoniously. There will be "scholars and artists of every description in countless numbers" in those days.[6] Thousands of brilliant talents will be brought to their fullest development—musicians, actors, artists, philosophers, not

[1] Die Frau, p. 156.
[2] Ibid., pp. 163, 164.
[3] Ibid., p. 160.
[4] Ibid., p. 179.
[5] Ibid., pp. 177, 186.
[6] Ibid., p. 161

professional, of course (for all must take part in the social production), but led on by inspiration, talent, and genius. "An age of arts and sciences will come such as the world has never seen before; and the artistic and scientific productions will be in proportion to the general progress."[1] Every one will also have occasion to indulge his taste for variety. He may make "a pleasure trip," visit foreign lands and continents; he may join scientific expeditions and colonization schemes of all kinds, which will then exist in great numbers, if he is disposed to render a corresponding service to society.[2] In short, the human heart will lack nothing which it can long for. The golden age of Saturn will return, and all men shall be happy.

Like Bebel, so also Stern[3] indulges his imagination to the fullest extent in describing the socialistic paradise of the future. Thus Bellamy's day-dreams have been seriously dreamt before by waking German scientific socialists. But dreams are an easy species of production for fertile imaginations.

II. *Industry and Economy in Socialism.*

It is a great pity that the gap between dreams and reality cannot be bridged. It is a stern fact that in thickly inhabited and civilized countries the earth is able to nourish its inhabitants only at the price of hard labor and great economy in the use of labor materials. Nor is there any lack of incentive to such economy in the modern social order, as is manifest. The interest of the individual, nay, the very necessity of self-preservation and self-advancement, urges most people to untiring and energetic labor. In the race for gain we need, therefore, a check rather than an incentive; nor is there any great extravagance to be observed in the use of labor

[1] Die Frau, p. 185. [2] Ibid., p. 188. [3] Thesen, pp. 25, 34.

means—raw materials, work tools, machinery, factories, means of transportation, etc. On such economy depends to a great extent the success of all modern enterprises. The great problem to be solved in every private enterprise is how to produce, with the least possible expense of labor, material, and time, the largest quantity of the best and cheapest goods. True, there will be always a number of bunglers and swindlers who will ply their trade; but such will not succeed in the long-run. Fraud will be detected in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred; and if it sometimes succeeds it is mostly by the fault of credulous or grasping dealers, and of legislatures and governments which do not use sufficient precaution and vigilance for the prevention of deceit. But how far would diligence and economy in the use of the means of production be practised in the socialistic commonwealth?

Here again Bebel comes forward with the most liberal promises. He is of opinion "that such an organization of labor, based on perfect freedom and equality, in which one would stand for all, and all for one, would awaken the highest consciousness of solidarity, would beget a spirit of joyous industry and emulation, such as is nowhere to be found in the industrial system of our day. . . . And this spirit would also exert its influence on the productiveness of labor and the perfection of produce.[1] Moreover, each individual and all together, since they labor for one another, have absolutely the same interest that all products should be not only as good and perfect as possible, but also should be produced with the greatest possible promptness, either to spare time or to gain time to produce new articles for the satisfaction of higher claims."[2]

[1] Die Frau, p. 154.
[2] Ibid., p. 154.

However, such promises are but idle talk. For what motive has the member of the socialistic state to toil honestly day by day and to use the labor materials economically? Only the smallest part of the fruit of his industry belongs to himself. If we imagine a million members of a socialistic commonwealth, each one reaps one millionth of the proceeds of his labor. And if he is idle, what does it matter? Only one millionth of the production which he neglects to bring forth is lost to him.

Even Schäffle,[1] who has the greatest sympathy with socialism, is of the opinion that "it is not sufficient, in the case of the common production of a million laborers, that producer A is conscious of the fact that his social income depends upon the fact that the nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine other co-operators labor as assiduously as he himself. This consciousness alone cannot exercise sufficient control, does not, at least, overcome the tendency to idleness and dishonesty, does not hinder cheating the community in regard to labor-time, does not thwart the sly and factious tendency to overtax one's own personal production. Socialism would have to engage each one's private interest at least so strongly for the collective production as is the case in private production. The socialistic state would have to reward the different departments for extraordinary collective production and punish them for industrial negligence; it would also have to reward superior technical progress and remunerate individual merit for the common weal; it would have to direct the numerous labor forces to that position in which they would be most productive, not by command of authority, however, but by the power of individual self-interest."

But in the social commonwealth there would be no private interest. If the state would, according

[1] Quintessenz, p. 31.

to Schäffle's opinion, confer distinctions and premiums sufficient to urge the laborer to years of restless toil, great differences in the conditions of life would soon arise and bring envy, jealousy, and discontent in their wake. Besides, such distinctions or premiums cannot consist with the socialistic theory of value.

We have reason to believe that socialism, instead of producing abundance of all necessaries of life with little toil, would soon be forced to lengthen the present work-day in order to prevent famine. According to Engel[1] there were in Prussia in the year 1881 to a population of 26,716,701 a total income of $2,382,676,591.50. In this estimate, however, the income was set one fourth higher than it actually was, as the real estimate was $1,972,386,965.50. Now, if this were equally divided among the population it would leave $89.25 to each person; and if we take each family to consist of four members it would leave each family an income of $357. This income, however, is still higher than it would be in the socialistic state in similar conditions; for since there would be no taxes first a deduction would have to be made, before the division would take place, of all that would be required for the maintenance of the productive system and for public institutions. If, then, in our present state such great exertion of power for production is attended with such small income, we have reason to fear that in the socialistic state the income would dwindle to insignificance. Besides, we must bear in mind that the day's work in the socialistic state would last only between two

[1] Der Wert des Menschen.

and three hours. Socialists, it is true, boast that idlers who would take no part in the public production would not exist in the socialistic state, as they do now. By this assertion, however, they acknowledge that freedom in the choice of employment would no longer exist in socialism, but it does not follow that the task of the individual would be lessened. The socialists build their hopes upon a false supposition—namely, that in the social order of the future all men and women will be actuated by the same zeal, industry, and economy.

Not a few socialists, and among them Schäffle, build great hopes upon the *mutual supervision* and control of the laborers. But such supposition is in many cases impossible, especially if several should unite together in a league of idleness. But where such supervision would be actuated, as in workshops of limited extent, it would necessarily lead to a regular system of petty surveillance and espionage. We have striking illustrations of the truth of this statement in the case of the national workshops erected in 1848 at the public expense at the suggestion of Louis Blanc. In a tailor's shop there was introduced, instead of payment by the piece, payment by the day, in the hope that mutual supervision would incite the laborers to diligence. But soon this mutual supervision degenerated into an invidious and petty espionage, and brought about so many bitter reproaches and quarrels that it was soon found necessary to return to the old system of payment by the piece in order to restore order and harmony among the workmen.

III. *Progress in the Socialistic State.*

If the necessary production would be impossible in the state of socialism, progress would be much more impossible. That private industry based on private property is conducive to progress is a fact which in our days is palpable. What wondrous progress has been made within this half-century! We need only recall the invention of steamboats, railroads, telegraphs, telephones, phonographs, and all the recent results achieved on the field of electro-dynamics. Almost every day brings unexpected improvements; for every one is bound by his own interest to make himself useful to his neighbor and, if possible, to outdo his competitors. Therefore every one endeavors to invent more comfortable, useful, cheaper appliances. He who offers the best and most useful commodities at the lowest price takes the lead in the race of competition.

What will become of this progress in socialism? Bebel with his usual boldness announces that in the socialistic commonwealth all will "turn their attention to improvement, simplification, and acceleration of the process of labor. Ambition to invent and discover will be aroused to the highest degree; one will try to outstrip the other in ideas and devices."[1] Such phrases only bespeak the popular agitator. All shall be intent upon inventions and discoveries. But suppose that the socialistic grade of education would enable all laborers to make inventions and discoveries—which is very doubtful—where is the

[1] Die Frau, p. 154.

interest that could incite them to new discoveries and inventions? And even though there were such interest, where would the laborer find means to make discoveries in the production of goods? Discoveries and inventions, at least in the field of industry, suppose the possession of productive goods wherewith one may experiment at pleasure. They suppose, moreover, that one is thoroughly trained in one department, which he makes the special study of a lifetime; consequently, that he is not directed at pleasure by a superintendent or council of production, or by the vote of the people, or by changes from one branch of industry to another, and thus made a bungler in every branch or trade. Schäffle[1] speaks of schools or guilds of "investigators, artists, scholars," which could be appointed by the socialistic commonwealth. But Bebel, who formerly made the same statement himself, denies the possibility of such classes. All have to take an active part in production; but the remaining free time may be employed by each individual in his favorite study. We have great reason to doubt that after the social productive labor leisure would still remain for scientific and artistic pursuits; and we have still more reason to doubt whether the members of the socialistic body would employ this time in earnest and solid study. We are inclined rather to think that they would devote their leisure to idleness and enjoyment.

But let that pass. We shall suppose that a socialist has made an important discovery. Now it remains to utilize it practically. In the supposition of private property this matter is comparatively

[1] Quintessenz, p. 5.

easy. If the inventor has capital, or if he succeeds to enlist interested capitalists, his discovery will soon make its way into the public, if it only proves effectual. But the case is different in the socialistic order. Here every inventor must either apply to the supreme director of production, or must bring his claim directly before the people and try to interest the majority in his behalf. This, however, is a matter of no slight difficulty. It is a difficult matter to win entire communities for any innovation, particularly if individuals have no private interest in the matter, but, on the contrary, thereby only impose new labors upon themselves. If there is question, for instance, of new machineries, heating and lighting apparatus, public buildings, highways, canals, tunnels, etc., the innovation or improvement at the outset will cost a large portion of the national labor. And if such an improvement is once decided upon, it must at the same time be introduced in the entire social body, in order that the conditions of labor and life may be equal with all. But will society in all cases tamely submit to all such innovations? We fear that in the socialistic state even such improvements as would certainly promise the greatest advantages from the very outset would fail to be introduced; and how much more such inventions as require repeated and costly experiments to test their efficiency?

Kleinwächter[1] makes the following just remark on the point in question: "In the socialistic state, in which the entire production would be in common and systematically organized, the annual labor task of the entire population would

[1] Schönberg's Handbuch, vol. i. p. 260.

have to be fixed and distributed among the laborers by the government. If, therefore, the government would find it desirable for the national production to introduce some innovation, and thus to increase the annual task of labor; and if the people, not being able at once to realize the advantages of such improvements, would consider the introduction of such appliances as superfluous, and would refuse to undertake the additional work—the government would in that case have no means to enforce its wishes against the majority of the population; and thus progress would be necessarily retarded. In short, in a socialistic state industrial progress would then only be possible when the majority of the people would favor it; and that, as all men know, is a tedious process."

Besides, it is a circumstance not to be overlooked that in our own present state of society inventions and improvements of the same kind can be simultaneously introduced and tested, so that a thorough trial of each innovation is possible; and, finally, that improvement or invention which commends itself not only to the judgment of a few theorists, but has stood a practical test, will survive as the fittest. Thus we have a guarantee that the best and most useful appliances will finally gain the upper hand. Such a thorough testing would be impossible in the state of the future, as it would entail a considerable increase of labor, which would hardly meet with a sufficient remuneration, and of the utility of which the people at large could with difficulty be convinced.

IV. *Arts and Sciences in Socialism.*

If bold statements were sufficient to produce desired effects, socialism would not be opposed, but highly beneficial, to arts and sciences. But if prog-

ress on the field of industry would be, as we have seen, greatly retarded in the socialistic organization, it is natural to expect that progress in the arts and sciences would be still more restricted. According to Bebel's programme, in the socialistic organization all without exception shall take a direct and "physical" part in production; consequently, there shall be no professional artists and scholars. This conclusion is strictly logical, but at the same time it shows the absurdity of the socialistic system. For it is manifest that under such conditions there would be no possibility of real progress, for he who will produce anything of considerable value on the field of art or science cannot cultivate these as a secondary object in leisure hours merely as an amateur, but must devote himself wholly to them from his very youth. But it must be borne in mind that socialism will introduce all, without exception, at an early stage of youth, into all branches of production, since production is the proper end, the only acknowledged purpose of the socialistic state. Moreover, those disagreeable employments for which no laborers will volunteer must be performed by all in their turn; and all without exception are bound their whole lives long to take an active part in production. Can there be, under such circumstances, any higher, scientific and artistic aspirations and activity? Will there be any taste and enthusiasm left for any branch of knowledge beyond physical labor? In our present state of society it is self-interest and necessity that urge on the youthful student to earnest labor. Upon his labor depends his future existence, his advancement, and his final position in society; whereas in the socialistic order

scientific and artistic abilities can have no influence upon a man's social standing. Remuneration will be gauged solely by the amount of production of one's labor, and not by those occupations to which one may devote himself for his amusement in leisure hours.

True, it sometimes happens in our day that men, without any regard to external advantages, from sheer love of science or art, undertake profound studies. But this is the exception, not the rule; and even these few have generally received the first impulse to study from bitter necessity or from self-interest; and they continue of their own pleasure the studies or researches which in the course of time have become for them a source of delight. But in a socialistic state there would be no such incentives for youth, since all, no matter what vocation they may choose, shall have exactly the same conditions of life.

But let us suppose that Bebel's demand—that all should in the same manner "physically" take part in the work of production—should be dropped as impracticable by socialists; that professional scholars, artists, and scientists should be tolerated. By avoiding Charybdis they strike upon Scylla. Thus they would be forced to abandon the socialistic theory of value, according to which all objects of use are to be estimated by the amount of labor consumed in their production; and by labor is here understood only such work as is either directly or indirectly productive. But there are many arts and sciences which have no value, or at least very small value, for production. What does poetry or music, for instance, contribute towards the national

production? What astronomy, philosophy, comparative philology, history, geology, etc.? And if such labors should nevertheless be remunerated by the community, what must be the standard by which they are to be estimated? But we must return to this point when we speak of the division of produce. Moreover, would not the unequal treatment of employing one as a scholar, artist, scientist, or professor, while another is forced to undergo the disagreeable labors of the mine or the factory, do away with the equal conditions of life and give occasion to jealousy and complaints? If socialists nowadays declaim against "unproductive entities" and "drones," how much more would they do so in the commonwealth of the future, when all would be conscious of their equal rights, and have the decision of all things in their own hands? We have already drawn attention to the fact that socialism would do away with freedom in the choice of a state or profession in life. If the state would appoint philosophers and scientists and artists, the lack of this freedom of choice would be still more keenly felt, for either it must be supposed that artists and scholars would be so placed as to enjoy respect, honor, and temporal emolument, and then all would rush to these professions, or we must suppose that they would have no distinction among their fellows, that they would have no more prestige than an ordinary shoemaker or tailor; and in this case there would be few candidates for the learned professions. In any case, the authorities would have to determine who should embrace the scientific and artistic professions.

The *freedom of the press* in socialism deserves

special consideration. True, we consider as objectionable that unlimited freedom of the press which allows all manner of outrage upon good morals, religion, lawful authority, marriage, property, etc., to go unpunished. But no less objectionable in our time, when different religious denominations are actually tolerated and live peaceably together, would be a censorship permitting that only to be published which would have the approval of state officials. But such a censorship would be necessary in the socialistic state.

All labor materials are the exclusive property of the community; consequently, also the printing-presses would be public institutions. The community must supply the materials and the labor-hands; it is also the task of the community to decide on what is to be printed and what to be put in the waste-basket. It would therefore depend entirely upon the majority of the respective committee, or of the entire people, whether a literary work, be its merit great or small, should ever see the light or not. The socialists pride themselves on this feature of their system. Bebel particularly boasts that in the state of the future much of the "rubbish" which in our time floods the book-market would never be published. But manifestly such a policy would destroy the good seed together with the cockle. True, many books, and among them much "rubbish," would remain unpublished; but very probably many works also of real literary merit would be suppressed, while much would doubtless also see the light which would fully deserve the name of "rubbish." For the question is, what is to be regarded as rubbish? One party considers a

work as worthless, while another considers it valuable, and a third even admires it, and *vice versa*. Very often, we fear, the most learned and scientific works would be branded as rubbish while frivolous and superficial productions would find their way through the press. Let us suppose the case that a citizen of the "state of the future" has gained the conviction that the socialistic order of society is highly unjust and absurd, and that he embodies and substantiates his opinion in a scientific work or in a series of popular essays. What will the socialistic censors judge of his lucubrations? What we say of scientific subjects would be still more true of religious questions. In the state of socialism a party would have it in its power to exclude from the press every religious opinion which it would find inconvenient. Or could authors appeal to the liberality and tolerance of the popular majority? The masses are generally more intolerant than individuals: the latter must regard public opinion, the former need not.

Like the printing-press so also the foundation and support of all kinds of scientific and artistic institutions—elementary, middle, and high schools, —industrial schools, clinics, libraries, museums, etc. would be placed under public direction; so that new establishments could not be set up except by vote of the majority. In the erection of such institutions the first question which would present itself to the consideration of the community would be the increase of the national labor, which would never, or at least not for many years, produce any industrial fruit.

In socialism slavery would go even to greater ex-

tremes. All buildings, particularly the great public edifices, would be the property of the entire state, which would dispose of them by means of its officials. No public building could, therefore, be erected for large assemblies, for divine worship, for public lectures, etc., except with the permission of the majority or of the state's representatives. But let this suffice: so much is certain from what we have said, that in the socialistic state the majority would have full power to oppress and to enslave the minority at pleasure. The latter would have no guarantee for their freedom except the good-will of the majority, or at the worst revolution, to which it might claim the same right as the socialists of to-day.

Section IV.

THE DIVISION OF PRODUCE.

We now come to that point of the socialistic system of which socialists are particularly proud, and which even commends itself to the sympathies of many who are not socialists. Is it not an undeniable fact, they say, that production is continually on the increase, and yet that the greater number of men live in extreme poverty? Whence this phenomenon? They answer: from the unjust distribution of industrial produce.

We readily grant that in our present system of distribution there is much that is defective and needs improvement. There are not a few capitalists who use the laborers unjustly for sordid gain; not a few who by dishonest speculation bring others'

property into their possession. What we would deny is this—that socialism, in all its schemes, has devised a fairer and better method of distribution.

We shall suppose that the annual proceeds of production in the socialistic state have turned out abundant—although this supposition from our former remarks must seem improbable; but we shall make this supposition, to put socialism in the most favorable light possible. From the total proceeds is first to be subtracted the amount necessary for the continuation of production, for the improvement of factories, for the purchase of raw materials, etc. By this deduction socialism will relieve the people of all taxation.

The remainder of the proceeds is to be justly divided among the individual members of the body social. Now it is evident, as we have already shown, that all will not be allowed to go to the public stores and indiscriminately, without further control, to take whatever they please. A certain clear, fixed, and practicable *standard* must be adopted; and the question is, what this standard shall be. Socialism has thus far devised not a single practicable standard. Socialists themselves are on this point, as on many other points of practical policy, somewhat reticent. Marx advocates a distribution of goods according to the amount of labor performed, at least in the primitive state of socialism; but in a more advanced phase of society, he adds, each one will draw "according to his reasonable wants." We shall now proceed to examine successively the practicability of the imaginable standards for distribution. We can imagine only five such standards that might be made the basis for the distribution of produce—the

number of persons, the labor time, the amount of labor performed, diligence, actual wants.

I. *Number of Persons as a Standard.*

A distribution of produce according to the number of persons of a given section or community has not, to our knowledge, been advocated by any socialist. And naturally so; for to give the same amount of the produce to each individual, whether diligent or idle, skilful or unskilful, strong or weak, whether his wants be few or many, would be evidently most unfair. Such a system would set a premium upon idleness and incapacity, and would blast all industry in the bud.

The preceding lines were written before Bellamy's novel came into our hands. The American fictionist of the future has all produce equally divided among all in his socialistic commonwealth. Each one, according to Bellamy, receives at the beginning of the year an equal number of credit cards, on which he can at all times draw an equal value of goods from the public storehouses. In every community or ward there is such a magazine, from which each one can draw exactly what he pleases. The value of the credit cards, given to all, is so high as considerably to surpass the ordinary wants of an individual or family. If, however, in an exceptional case the value of the card is not sufficient, each one may receive credit in advance for the following year. For, as Bellamy remarks, the nation is wealthy, and does not wish its members to suffer any want. Economy is no longer considered a virtue. No one is concerned for the morrow, whether for himself or for his children, for the nation guarantees nourishment, education, and comfortable support to all its citizens, from the cradle to the grave. What luxury must develop from such a state of things, in which economy is no longer considered a virtue, may be easily imagined.

How we are to judge of the assertion that the socialistic state shall be so rich that there will be no more need of economy, and that supplies will be equal to the demands in all sections, we may easily conclude from what has been said under a previous heading.

But how will Bellamy reconcile with justice the principle that no regard is had for the amount of labor performed, for capacity, and for the experience and skill of individuals; that the weakest, the most stupid, and most inexperienced receive the same remuneration as the strongest, the most skilful, and the most experienced? Bellamy, through his mouth-piece Dr. Lecte, replies to this difficulty that the amount of labor performed has nothing to do with the distribution of produce, since this is a question of merit; and merit is a moral idea, while the quantity of produce is material. It would be a remarkable kind of logic, he thinks, to endeavor to decide a moral question by a material standard. The degree of effort alone is decisive in regard to merit; whence we do not reward a horse because he bears a heavier burden than a goat would bear. But if Bellamy would compare man with a horse he must be consistent, and deny him all merit also in view of effort. We do not attribute true merit to a horse, no matter how great has been his effort; we do not feed him on account of his merits, but on account of his usefulness: and thus too Bellamy must treat the man of the future, if he wishes to be consistent.

But merit is a moral idea, and the quantity of labor produced is material. As to this quibble, Bellamy contradicts himself; for the effort of the laborer is at least mainly material or physical; why, then, does Bellamy attribute merit to it? Or does he imagine that only the effort, but not the product of labor or the labor performed, is a rational moral activity? But when we ascribe merit to labor performed we do not understand by it the physical product of labor as such, but the performance itself, in as much as it is a valuable, creative activity. We reward, not the food which the cook prepares for our use, but the labor of cooking, the value of which, it is true, we determine by the product or the food cooked.

When Bellamy asserts that merit is something moral we

must distinguish between formal merit as such—that is, in as much as it implies a right to a reward, and the title of merit, —or the meritorious action. The former, it is true, is something purely moral, the latter is not. The title of merit is an action which is useful for another; and whenever there is not question of moral merit (with God), but of physical merit (with man), its value is determined according to the usefulness of the action performed for the benefit of our fellowmen or society—always supposing, of course, that the action is free and imputable to the subject.[1]

II. *Labor-time as a Standard.*

The labor-time alone cannot serve as a standard for the distribution of the proceeds of labor; for a more skilful, better trained, more practised and diligent laborer produces more in the same time than one in whom these qualities are deficient. Marx himself felt this difficulty. Therefore he wished the value of every commodity to be determined not by the labor actually spent in its production, but by "the socially required unit of labor-time"—that is, by the time which is required "to produce a given value under given normal social conditions of labor, and with a given socially required grade of skill and intensity." Hence the share of each laborer in the entire production would have to be determined by the "*socially required labor-time.*" But this standard of distribution could be regarded as just only in the supposition of Marx's theory of value. If the exchange-value of useful commodities does not consist in the "crystallized" labor contained in them, as Marx would have it, but chiefly in the difference of their use-value, it

[1] Looking Backward, chap. ix.

is manifestly unjust not to regard the *difference of the labor-forces*, but to treat all according to the same norm. Let us suppose five laborers working side by side in a factory. How is the share of the universal produce to be determined which falls to the lot of each? According to the "average of skill and intensity of the [social] labor." But this average is a mere abstraction. Actually, perhaps, none of the five laborers has the average mean. Some have more than the average, some less. It were folly to suppose that all possessed the same skill and labored with the same intensity; for men differ greatly from one another. But why should the laborer who possesses greater skill get credit only for average skill, and why should he who possesses less than the average skill get credit for the skill which he does not possess?

Marx established the proposition, and the German social democrats received it into their programme, that useful labor—labor which produces exchange-value—is possible only for society, not for individuals. However, though this proposition should be conceded, it would not thence follow that all the members of society produced the same amount of labor and have the same right to remuneration; but the proposition itself is untrue, and has been established only for the purpose of gaining some semblance of right to weld individuals into the machine of public production. True, useful commodities can gain exchange-value only where several persons are living together and one possesses what the other does not. But this supposed exchange-value depends chiefly upon use-value; and to produce useful commodities personal ability is sufficient. Could not Robinson Crusoe produce many articles for his own use? Or would socialists only say that personal labor is in many respects dependent upon society? If so, logically speaking, labor-power is no longer private property, but must be considered

the property of the community; and the community must, consequently, have the right to dispose of such common labor at pleasure, independently of the individual laborer. But such an admission is contrary to the principle of socialism, which boasts to secure to every laborer the full proceeds of his labor as his own personal property.

The standard of the division of produce by the "necessary social unit" of labor-time is, therefore, unjust and rests upon a false assumption. But it is also impracticable. Here as in similar difficulties Bebel[1] cuts the knot and simply declares: "The labor-time which is required to produce a certain object is the standard according to which its social use-value is to be determined. Ten minutes of social labor-time in one object are exchangeable for ten minutes of social labor-time in another object—no more and no less."

Let us examine the matter practically. We wish to know how much social labor-time is contained in a peck of wheat. One farmer is diligent and skilful and cultivates his field in a much shorter time and in a much better manner than another. The distance of the fields from the farmers' residences, the roads, the farming implements, are different. But above all, the produce depends to a great extent upon the quality of the soil, upon the kind and quantity of manure, upon the climate and the favorable or unfavorable weather. The same soil will produce in different years very different crops. Who, then, can determine the socially required unit of labor-time contained in a peck of wheat? With the same labor an acre of land in the fertile districts of the

[1] Die Frau, p. 162.

Rhine will produce double or three times the crop which by the same labor will be reaped on an acre in the Harz Mountains or on the sandy plains of Holland. One need only recall these difficulties to perceive that the calculation of the socially required unit of labor-time, even for a single commodity, is a thing impossible.

But this is only the beginning of the difficulty. What we say of wheat is true in like manner of all kinds of grain and vegetables, nay, of all agricultural products (meat, butter, cheese, eggs, etc.). The same may be said of the produce of mines, fisheries, etc. Who could determine the unit of labor-time for such products as change from year to year and even from month to month? We say nothing of the fact that it is altogether an erroneous process to determine the exchange-value of commodities by the unit of time required for their production.

The difficulty increases if we admit that in the society of the future there would be paid judges, physicians, surgeons, artists, scholars, etc. Schäffle[1] says: "Those who would render useful services to the community as judges, magistrates, teachers, artists, scientists, not in the production of physical goods, would have a share in the real products of the national labor in proportion to the time spent in useful services to society."

In proportion to the time spent in useful services to society! Did Schäffle consider the difficulty of calculating this proportion? How is the time spent in useful services to society to be determined in the case of the scientist, the artist, and the philosopher?

[1] Quintessenz, p. 5.

Should all be treated in the same way? Would all physicians get the same salary, whether skilful or unskilful, experienced or otherwise? Are physicians to draw a higher salary than philosophers, artists, and teachers? Again, shall an elementary teacher receive the same pay as a professor of an intermediate school or of a university? It would be unjust to treat them all alike. It would be an outrage to the more gifted and industrious. But an unequal salary would be contrary to the fundamental principles of socialism, and be a constant source of jealousy and contention. Nor could the present scale of payment be retained in the socialistic state, for the present system, as Schäffle remarks, would on the very first day be upset by social democracy: and justly so, for it is contrary to the equal rights of all; and it would of necessity lead to a social aristocracy, by whatever name we might choose to call it.

III. *The Labor performed as a Standard.*

The labor performed is another standard according to which, absolutely speaking, the distribution of produce might be determined. This standard is suggested by the Gotha programme and by the leaders of the socialists. "Superior production," says Bebel,[1] "will receive higher remuneration, but only in proportion to the labor performed." As far as the labor performed can be determined by the socially required unit of labor-time, we have shown it to be an impracticable standard. But if the labor performed is gauged not only by the labor-time, but

[1] Unsere Ziele, p. 30.

also according to its intrinsic value, we must take into consideration, besides the time, also skill, strength, practice, and diligence. For upon all these elements depend the quantity and quality of the labor performed. But, particularly, the various kinds of employment in which one is engaged for the benefit of society must be compared with one another, and estimated according to their relative values. For all occupations have not, as socialists pretend, the same value for society; and, consequently, they do not deserve the same remuneration. No one, for instance, will consider the work of a fireman or of a stable-boy of the same value as the services of a physician or of a professor of a university. But who will pretend to have sufficient shrewdness and wisdom to determine from the consideration of the various factors the relative value of each occupation according to the demands of justice? How totally different are the opinions of men on the relative value of labor! One considers this occupation more valuable, while another attributes greater value to a different occupation. In estimating the value of labor, much depends upon subjective views. Could, therefore, a standard so complicated, so totally dependent upon subjective opinions, be employed for the distribution of produce without giving occasion to constant discontent and discord?

From what we have already said we may easily conclude the impracticability of the standard of distribution proposed by Rodbertus,[1] who suggests that the proceeds should be distributed according to the

[1] Der Normalarbeitstag, 1871.

normal *day's work* [Werkarbeitstag], as distinguished from the *work-day* [Zeitarbeitstag]. First, the labor-time, or the normal working-day, must be determined —that is, the time which a workman of medium strength and with average exertion can permanently work every day in a given industry. This time is different in different branches of industry. If this normal time is once found, then it remains to determine the amount of labor to be performed—that is, that amount which an average laborer, with average skill and with medium diligence, can in a given industry produce in the normal work-time. This amount of labor Rodbertus calls the *day's work*, as distinguished from the *work-day*, or normal labor-time.

The normal day's work in one branch of industry, according to Rodbertus, has the same value as the normal day's work in another, or, to put it more universally, the *products of the same labor-time are equal in value.* If, for instance, a pair of shoes forms a day's work in the shoe industry, and a table five days' work in the joiner's trade, a table is worth five times as much as a pair of shoes.

Attempts have been made to calculate the normal day's work for different trades : even for the simplest labor such a calculation is most tedious and complicated, and at best only approximately correct. For, as Rodbertus remarks, it is not sufficient to calculate the labor directly employed by the shoemaker to make a pair of shoes, but it is necessary also to reckon the wear of the shoemaker's tools in the operation. But to make this latter calculation it is necessary to know the value of all the shoemaker's instruments, of the various materials that go to make a pair of shoes—leather, thread, nails, hammer, awl—and, moreover, to cal-

culate how many days' work might be performed by every one of these instruments.

This standard of Rodbertus rests on the assumption that the value of an object is determined *solely by the labor* consumed in its production. But this assumption, as we have proved, is false. Good wine, fruit, timber, cloth, grain, or land, is sold at a higher price than the same quantity of the same object of an inferior quality, and that independently of the labor consumed upon it. Why are fresh articles of food—fruit, meat, butter, etc.—sold at a higher price than stale ones? Every child can answer this question. Should this simple question puzzle political economists like Rodbertus? It is upon the usefulness of an object that its value chiefly depends. This is also the case, as we have seen, with human labor; and therefore it is erroneous to make the day's work in one branch of industry equivalent to the day's work in another.

The normal day's work, moreover, is impracticable as a standard of distribution because there are many industries and activities to which it is impossible to apply it. Who, for instance, can determine the day's work of a physician, a scientist, a teacher, an astronomer, an historian, a state official? The tailor or shoemaker can preserve the product of his labor and have it estimated by competent judges. But what has the physician, or the scientist, or the astronomer, or the magistrate, or the teacher to show? What can the husbandman present if drought, or frost, or hail has destroyed his crops? Or what can the huntsman or fisherman exhibit if he happens to be unsuccessful in his efforts? The standard of the

day's work, moreover, is not consistent with the social democratic system. For it would necessarily bring in its wake considerable social inequalities. Rodbertus himself acknowledges that the day's work standard would introduce the piece-system into the socialistic state. If, for instance, he who has performed one normal day's work receives payment equivalent to one, he who in the same time performs two normal days' work receives double the amount. But he who has performed only half a day's work will receive but half pay. Now, it is not at all impossible that a strong, healthy, skilful laborer should do twice or three times as much work as another who is weaker and less skilful. Thus considerable social inequality would soon arise, especially if the weaker laborers would, by sickness or other accidents, be for a considerable time prevented from work; for we suppose that the man who works a whole day receives better pay than he who is sick and unfit to work. Otherwise all incentives to labor would soon cease, and the rush to the public infirmaries would be universal. However feelingly the social democrats may speak of "brotherly spirit" and devotion to the common good, they cannot remove the dread of toil under which a great portion of humanity labors.

IV. *Diligence as a Standard.*

Much less than the amount of labor performed can *diligence* alone serve as a standard for the distribution of produce. It would be simply unjust to regard diligence as the only norm, since such a standard would put the more skilful and expert laborers on the same footing with the slowest and most awk-

ward. Moreover, how could the diligence of each one be accurately determined? Bellamy thinks that in a socialistic state each one should receive an equal share of the produce if he only makes equal endeavor, or produces that of which he is capable. That is all easily said; but who shall judge whether each one does his best? How are we to form a definite judgment upon such an endeavor? At best only by an extensive system of mutual supervision and espionage. But such a system would manifestly be an unbearable yoke, which the sovereign people would on the very first day shake off with indignation. And even if such control could be permanently established, how easy would it be to deceive the overseers, especially if many laborers would conspire against them? What guarantee could an overseer give who would be elected and might be deposed at any minute? Finally, if a laborer would be found guilty of a lack of diligence, how much then should be deducted from his wages, and who is to judge of the amount? We are of opinion that if such a standard were introduced, our prisons, which socialists would have abolished, would soon have to be replaced by more numerous and capacious ones.

V. *The Wants of Individuals as a Standard.*

It would be still more unjust and impracticable to distribute the produce of labor according to "the wants of individuals," or, as the Gotha programme would have it, "to each one according to his reasonable demands." What are the reasonable demands? Not all have the same wants. Evidently it would

not be wise to leave to individuals themselves the decision concerning their wants. No one is an impartial judge in his own case; and, besides, experience teaches that demands do not exactly coincide with real wants.

The only expedient that would be left, therefore, would be to appoint for each district a "committee on wants," whose task it would be to determine the real needs of individuals—for instance, how many glasses of beer the workman of the future would actually need. And as such a commission would necessarily consist of Solons and Aristideses, who would decide, not according to personal regards, but only according to right and justice, and would always hit upon the right thing; and as, moreover, the socialistic brethren, as Bebel loves to characterize them, would be animated with a "brotherly spirit," and would be content with little, this most delicate problem would be solved to the greatest satisfaction of all, and the social machinery would move in the greatest peace and harmony.

Section V.

THE FAMILY IN THE SOCIALISTIC STATE.

THE family is without doubt the mainstay of every well-ordered commonwealth. If socialism destroys the family it must necessarily be looked upon as the enemy of order, freedom, civilization, and Christianity itself.

I. *Marriage in the Socialistic State.*

We can appeal to the explicit and unequivocal evidence of its most indefatigable defenders for the

fact that socialism leads to the dissolution of the family. It will suffice to hear the evidence of a single leader, who may be said to represent the universal sentiment. Bebel writes of the position of woman in the socialistic state as follows:

"In the choice of the object of her love she [woman] is no less free than man: she loves, and is loved, and enters into the marriage alliance with no other regard than that of preference. This alliance is, as in olden times [?], a *private* agreement, without the intervention of any [public] functionary. . . . Man should be free to dispose of the strongest instinct of his nature as of every other natural instinct. The gratification of the sexual instinct is just in the same way the personal affair of every individual as is the satisfaction of any other natural appetite. Therefore no one is obliged to render an account of such gratification; nor is any uncalled-for intermeddler permitted to interfere in this matter. Prudence, education, and independence will facilitate and direct the proper choice. If disagreement, disappointment, or disaffection should arise, morality [!] demands a disruption of the unnatural and, consequently, immoral alliance."[1]

Here we have unvarnished "free-love." What remains of the bond of marriage if the parties, following every whim and transient disaffection, are free to separate and to enter upon another alliance? However, we do not mean to confine ourselves to such explicit teaching of socialists. We shall endeavor to show that socialism *of its very nature* demolishes the family, which is the foundation of the social order. The basis upon which the indissolubility of marriage, and consequently the stability of the family, chiefly rests is the education of children. It is chiefly for this purpose that the life-

[1] Die Frau, p. 192.

long union of man and wife is necessary; for such a life-long union is generally required for the suitable education of their offspring. Therefore whoever wrests the education of their children from the hands of parents, and makes it a function of the state, thereby undermines the lowest foundation of the family. But socialism puts education and instruction altogether into the hands of the commonwealth. The Gotha programme, and, in short, socialistic platforms generally, demand "universal and equal education for all by the state." On this point too we shall insert the words of the great apostle of socialism:

"Every child that comes into the world, whether male or female, is a welcome increase to society; for society beholds in every child the continuation of itself and its own further development; it, therefore, perceives from the very outset the duty, according to its power, to provide for the new-born child. And, first of all, the mother who gives birth to and nurses the child is the object of the state's concern. Comfortable lodging, pleasant surroundings, and accommodations of all kinds suited to this stage of motherhood, careful treatment of herself and of her offspring, are the first care of society. It is self-evident that the mother must be left to nurse the child, as long as this is possible and necessary.

"When the child waxes stronger his equals await him for common amusement, under public direction. Here again all things are supplied which, according to the perfection of human knowledge and wisdom, for the time being, tend towards the development of soul and body. Then comes the kindergarten with its play-rooms; and, at a later period, the child is playfully introduced into the elements of knowledge and human activity. Mental and bodily labor, gymnastic exercises, free movement on the play-ground and in the gymnasium, on the ice field and in the natatorium; marching, fencing, and other exercises for both sexes, shall succeed and relieve each other in due order. The intro-

duction to the various kinds of useful labor—to manufacture, gardening, farming, and to the entire mechanism of production—follows in due succession. But the intellectual development, in the meantime, on the various fields of science, is not to be neglected. Corresponding to the high grade of social culture shall be the outfit of the lecture-halls, the educational appliances, and the means of instruction. All means of education and instruction, clothing and food, supplied by the community, will be such as to give no pupil an advantage over another. The number and the ability of the teaching body will be in proportion to the demands.

"Such will be the education of both sexes—equal and common—for the separation of the sexes can be justified only in those cases in which the distinction of sex makes it an imperative duty. And this system of education, strictly organized, under efficient control, continued to that stage of life when society shall declare its youth to be of age, will eminently qualify both sexes for all rights and duties which society grants or imposes on its full-grown members. Thus society can rest satisfied that it has educated members that are perfectly developed in every direction."[1]

This is one of the midsummer night's dreams in which Bebel's "Frau" delights to revel. How deeply immoral such dreams are needs hardly to be stated. The usurpation of education by the state, however, is quite logical according to the principles of socialism. If socialism will effect absolute equality in the conditions of life, it must first of all remove the universal source of social inequality, i.e., unequal education; and this can be done only by making education a social concern. Such a regulation would, of course, not hinder mothers from suckling their own children and nursing them to a certain age. But mothers and children would stand under the supervision of the body social; for there would be no servants in those

[1] Die Frau, pp. 182, 183.

days: physicians, surgeons, midwives, etc., would be in the service of the body politic; those able to work would have to contribute their share to the social production, while the care of those unable to work would devolve upon the community. The care and treatment of mothers in confinement and of their children would, of course, be the concern of the state. For if the care of the children were left to the parents it might happen that childless husbands and wives who have never been prevented from work would attain to a much higher income than others who would have to provide for the support of a numerous family, and would thus be prevented from taking an active part in production. And if the father or mother should fall sick it might easily happen that an entire family would be exposed to starvation, while another would enjoy all comforts. And how could a mother without the aid of servants bring up and educate a large family, say of ten or twelve children? If, therefore, education were left to the parents themselves it would be the duty of the community at least to give an additional allowance from the public produce for their support, and to make provision for them in case of sickness. In any case, parents would have to be relieved by the state of supporting their children.

Therefore both the nourishment and the education of the children in the socialistic state would be a public affair, and would be directed and controlled by the entire body social. Thus the chief duty of parents, for the sake of which marriage has been instituted as an indissoluble union, would cease to exist; for a life-long union and co-operation on the part of parents is not required for the mere

propagation of children. And even though in the socialistic state the indissolubility of marriage might be sanctioned by law, yet the integrity of the family would receive the death-blow. That which binds husband and wife most closely is not only the actual existence of offspring, but, above all, the consciousness that upon their united efforts and care depends the weal or woe of their children. Parents have to provide for the support and the development of their children; upon their care, above all, depend the life, the future position, the social standing, the honor, and the eternal welfare of their children. This consciousness urges them on to untiring activity. What they have been able to accumulate by their toil falls to the advantage of their offspring, in whom they, as it were, continue to live, and who naturally inherit the fruits of their cares and toils.

On the other hand, the consciousness that they owe to their parents, not only their life itself, but also their preservation, education, and position in society—in short, all they possess—binds the children in intimate love to their parents. They know that their own fortune is closely linked together with that of their parents. Hence there exists between them mutual sympathy in joys and sorrows. In socialism all this would cease to exist; for the entire social body would form but one family. What would become of parental authority if children knew that the state provided for their sustenance, or, at least, remunerated parents for the care bestowed upon them? Would not such a system greatly promote rash marriages and facilitate divorces, particularly as in the socialistic state marriage would be a private concern?

II. *Education and Instruction.*

Let us now cast a brief glance at *education* and *instruction* in the socialistic state. As we have already stated, Bebel promises the most marvellous results on the field of education. But now let us imagine children collected in large numbers, separated from their parents, first in the spacious playrooms of the kindergarten, then in the elementary schools, where they are "playfully" introduced into the elements of knowledge. Will this mass or wholesale education lead to satisfactory results? We might consider this possible if there were question only of a military education for the formation of future soldiers. But the universal application of such a system is simply absurd. Nor can the socialist point to the example of present educational institutions in which children receive not only instruction, but also their board and education, as in the family. For, to say nothing of the fact that the children are generally not confided to such institutions before the age of ten or twelve years, and that the pupils of such institutions form but a small fraction of the entire youth, while socialism would have all children without exception confided to public institutions for care and instruction—the chief difference consists in this, that our present boarding educational institutions presuppose and are based upon the existence of home training. The teachers of such institutions are the representatives of parents, and are supported by the parents' authority; and if a pupil of such an institution is incorrigible, he will, to his own disgrace and the

shame of his parents, be expelled from the institution. But this would not be the case in the socialistic state. Besides, we must bear in mind that the socialistic youth would be brought up without religion; that there would be no separation of the sexes. What, then, would be the result? Nothing would remain but forcibly to lash the socialistic youth into discipline and order. And yet how ineffectual is physical force in education!

Yet we have not done with the difficulties arising from the socialistic principles of education. It is impossible that all children should be instructed and educated in all branches of knowledge and industry. Bebel repeatedly asserts the contrary; yet it remains simply impossible. Let us suppose that in a certain grade the instruction and education is the same for all. Beyond this grade, however, a division would have to take place. Not all have talents for arts and sciences, and still fewer there are who have abilities to take up all studies. Not all have sufficient skill for the practice of all trades and industries. If, therefore, the socialists would not be satisfied with a very low and insufficient grade of culture, if they would not make shallowness and superficiality universal attributes of education, they must at a certain stage, say at the age of twelve or thirteen, draw a line, and then allow their pupils to devote themselves to some special branches of knowledge or industry. But who is to determine the studies to be pursued? The simplest system would be to submit the pupils to examinations; for a decision by the children themselves, or by their parents, or by the verdict of a committee, or by the vote of the majority, would be impracti-

cable. The parents manifestly would in most cases present their children for the highest grade of education, as they themselves would not have to bear the expenses and trouble. The children, on the other hand, even the most gifted, if left to themselves, would in most cases be satisfied with little learning. If the decision were left to a committee it would lead to unjust treatment, and consequently to endless complaints on the part of those parents whose children would be slighted.

The promotion to higher studies, therefore, would have to be made dependent on the results of examinations. But even this method would be attended with serious difficulties. For either we suppose that higher grades of education would be connected with certain advantages in regard to income and social standing, or we suppose that they would not. If a higher grade of education has no advantage for future life, very few would be found to aspire to it. If, on the other hand, it should have some influence upon the future social standing of the possessor, it would result in a difference of social position, and thus it would be all over with the socialistic equality of the conditions of life. Moreover, if social position is not made altogether dependent upon the labor performed according to the logical programme of socialism, but upon other conditions, why should talent alone be taken into account? Do not also virtue, diligence, and the descent from parents who have merited well of the commonwealth deserve consideration? Is it not harsh, nay, unjust, to make the entire future of a man's life depend upon a school examination in his youth?

As the promotion to higher studies, so also the decision what trade or industry each one should embrace would have to depend upon examinations; for as in branches of knowledge, so also in trades and industry an equal education of all is a thing of impossibility. If too many candidates would pass the examination for a certain branch of industry, they would have to be applied by superior authority to different industries. Therefore from the very outset the body social would have to decide the course of education and the future vocation of all and each of its members, lest there should be too great a rush to any profession, or to any particular trade or industry. Socialism and freedom, therefore, are incompatible with each other. The irreconcilable contradiction between freedom and the "absolute systematic control" of the national labor is the rock upon which socialism is destined to be shipwrecked.

Section VI.

SOME OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

I. *Communism in Religious Orders.*

It has been advanced in favor of socialism that in the religious orders of the Catholic Church perfect communism reigns. Why, then, should it not be practicable in entire nations? There is, however, between the Catholic religious orders and socialism an impassable gulf. Socialism aims at the universal introduction of a system which, of its very nature, demands the greatest detachment from earthly

things and an earnest struggle for perfection, and which, consequently, in the present order of things is suited only for the few. True, where men who have renounced all earthly goods and have devoted themselves to the service of God and of their neighbor voluntarily unite in common life, there may be community of goods without discord and contention; nay, such a system in that case will prove most beneficial, as it will relieve the individuals of the care of providing for their earthly wants. But as men generally are, few are able to rise to such a height of self-denial, and to devote themselves entirely to the pursuit of self-perfection and to the divine service. It is, therefore, a vain and unreasonable attempt to force men generally to renounce all private property and to endeavor violently to weld them together into a mechanical organization for the purpose of production.

Socialists, it is true, plead that they demand not the renunciation of property—that they only desire to establish property upon the basis of justice. These are fair words, but without meaning. He who wishes to abolish private property in all the materials of labor substantially abolishes private ownership. Property in mere articles of use must of its very nature be limited and is not sufficient to secure to man the necessary freedom of action and movement. If man is deprived of private property in the materials of labor he is thereby made an integral part of the great public industrial machine, and thus loses all independence of action. Of this fact we believe every one who has carefully followed our exposition will be convinced.

Moreover, the analogy can afford no argument

for this reason—because in religious orders communism is based upon celibacy. Perfect poverty or the renouncement of all temporal goods is incompatible with married life and with the duties which married life entails. It is utterly irreconcilable with family life in the present state of humanity.

II. *Modern Industrial Organizations.*

The objection taken by socialists from *modern industrial organizations* seems to have greater force at first sight. In the present social order it is no rare phenomenon that eight or ten or even more thousands of laborers are employed in one great industrial department; and yet the industry proceeds in the very best order. Nor do the labor materials and the machinery belong to the laborers themselves, nay, not even to the directors of such industrial establishments. Why should not such a system be extended to an entire state?

This objection overlooks but one feature, and that is the chief distinction between private industry and the socialistic organization. This modern industrial order in great manufactories and other industries is based upon the strongest moral force. The owner of the factory or industry, either in person or by means of his representative, confronts the laborers as proprietor and can rule them with almost absolute power. The laborer, it is true, is not forced to offer his service to such establishments, but if he wishes to obtain from them labor and support he must submit unconditionally to their ruling. The least insubordination will be the cause of his dismissal. Therefore force controls the modern system of

production, but only moral force, to which each one submits for his own interest. In the socialistic state, on the other hand, the directors of the various industries would confront the laborers not as proprietors, but as equals, possessing the same rights. Each one has the same right as his neighbor to consider himself a proprietor; nor can any one be dismissed; but every one must get work, for the simple reason that all private production is interdicted. The practicability of large private industrial institutions, therefore, does not prove the possibility of extending the same system to entire states. The arguments taken from the state industries which have been attempted by some governments, such as railroads, mail service, telegraphs, state mines, etc., do not conclude in favor of socialism. For in these public industries also the state or its representatives are considered as proprietors in their relation to the laborers. Besides, the directors are personally interested in such establishments, and are themselves also under the influence of the same moral force as the laborers. Every official as well as every laborer must be satisfied with his position. There is no alternative left him, if he wishes to gain his livelihood. Besides, he may be dismissed at pleasure or his salary may be curtailed if he gives any occasion of complaint to his superiors. Even a slight murmur on his part may suffice to deprive him of his position. Hence it is that in our modern state industries, wherever they have obtained, main force is the ruling power, and all is directed by absolute control. But in the socialistic state of the future, in which every man is to be a sovereign and to receive his position and his support from the community, in

which, moreover, the final decision regarding the control of labor, the division of produce, the appointment of officers, should be the business of the people, the case would be quite different.

III. *The Modern Military System.*

Socialists endeavor to fetch an argument for the possibility of their system from the organization and direction of our huge modern armies. However, it is manifest that a strict military organization with a criminal code including, as in Germany, for instance, some thirty capital crimes, could not be extended to an entire people and brought to bear upon all phases of human life. The socialists at least must lay aside their high-sounding phrases about freedom and equality if they would impose upon us such military discipline. However, we have no reason to fear that such a scheme will so easily be realized. For, what would become of an army if the soldiers themselves had the chief command—if they chose their own officers and generals, and deposed them at pleasure, and held court-martial over them? Our modern armies are under the strictest discipline and subordination. An army on democratic principles is chimerical. Besides, we must bear in mind that socialism undertakes to organize not only military activity, but the entire social life —production, commerce, education, instruction, the press, the arts and sciences, etc. If, then, even an organization on socialistic principles is impracticable for military purposes, how much more so for the varied and more complex relations of social life !

IV. *Stock Companies.*

Stock companies require special consideration, since they have been advanced in favor of socialism, for the reason that the capital invested in them not rarely produces large gains, although it is almost entirely alienated from the hands of the proprietors or shareholders. Extensive enterprises in commerce, industry, mining, railroads, steamboats, etc., prove remarkably successful in companies or syndicates, although their directors have no personal interest in them.

However, the absence of personal interest is but apparent in these cases. In regard to the subordinate officials of such companies the same rule holds as in the case of state industries—their own personal interest binds them to their position; and the higher authorities or directors confront the laborers in the capacity of proprietors. But the directors of these syndicates have themselves large interests in the enterprises and are, consequently, concerned for their success and prosperity; for in most cases they are among the chief shareholders, and in case the enterprises are prosperous they obtain larger dividends. Even the subordinate officials of such companies have in many cases a share of the profit. Since, therefore, the directors have an almost absolute power over the officers appointed and the laborers employed by them, it is easy to perceive the reason why such companies, notwithstanding the apparent sequestration of the capital, should realize large profits.

For the rest, it is a well-known fact that stock

companies, compared with private enterprises, are at a disadvantage in regard to economy in the use of raw materials, machinery, etc.; and, consequently, such organizations with small capital are generally unsuccessful. But in the case of large syndicates with extensive capital these disadvantages are counterbalanced by other advantages.[1]

Another essential difference between syndicates and the ideal socialistic organization is the circumstance that in syndicates the directors are rarely changed. The permanence of the directors is a necessary condition for the success of large enterprises. If the direction is often changed there is a lack of unity and system, as the opinions of the directors will rarely be found to coincide. What guarantee would there be for this necessary permanence in the direction of the industrial organizations in socialism, in which the directors would be chosen and deposed by popular vote, and in which the principle of the equal rights of all would admit of no permanence in the administration of the more influential offices? And if the supreme directors of industrial organizations have not sufficient power in their hands, and if their decision is made dependent upon the consent of the majority, they are thus deprived of the power necessary for the efficient administration of their offices.

[1] Cf. Leroy-Beaulieu, Le Collectivisme, p. 348, sq.

CONCLUSION.

HERE we shall bring our investigation of socialism to a close. We trust that the unprejudiced reader who has patiently followed us throughout our exposition has gained the conviction that socialism, even in its most rational and scientific form, is visionary and impracticable. It is based on untenable religious, philosophic, and economic principles, and, far from leading to the glorious results held out by its advocates to the unlearned masses, would prove disastrous to that culture which Christianity has produced, and reduce human society to a state of utter barbarism. We may, therefore, conclude in the words of Leo XIII., "On the Condition of Labor": "Hence follows the untenableness of the principle of socialism, according to which the state should appropriate all private property and convert it into common property. Such a theory can only turn out to the grave disadvantage of the laboring classes, for whose benefit it has been invented. It is opposed to the natural rights of every individual human being; it perverts the true purpose of the state, and renders the peaceful development of social life impossible." However, a permanent institution of socialism is not to be feared, since it is in open contradiction with the indestructible instincts and tendencies of human nature.

Yet no one can fail to see the grave dangers that threaten society from the socialistic agitation. Now, if we would avert those dangers we must co-operate in earnest, each in his sphere, towards *social reform.* A social life worthy of a human being must be secured for even the lowest of the laboring classes. For this end it is necessary not only that he receive sufficient wages, but also that sufficient regard be had for his life and health, and therefore that his strength be not overtaxed by immoderate labor. He must be treated not only with fairness, but also with love and consideration. Finally, he must have the assurance that in case of misfortune or ill-health he be not abandoned or cast into the street. And since in our days personal effort and private charity are by no means sufficient, *public authority must by suitable legislation take the necessary measures* for this end. The social reform should aim at such a state of things that the humblest laborer may entertain a well-founded hope by industry and economy to better his condition, and gradually rise to a higher social standing.[1]

It may be objected that we have in this work to some extent ignored the just claims of socialism. However, if we consider what is *peculiar* to socialism as such in contradistinction to other social reform movements—and this is precisely the point in question—socialism cannot be said to possess any just claims. If there is any justice in the claims of socialists it consists in their opposition to the extreme individualism of the liberal movement.

Man may be conceived under a twofold aspect—

[1] Cf. Moral Philosophie, vol. ii. pp. 508–521.

as a free and independent *individual*, and as a *social being*, destined to live in, and form part of, society. Liberalism—at least in bygone years—considered man only under the first aspect. It regarded only the individual and his independence, and almost entirely disregarded his social relations. From this standpoint liberalism tended towards the dismemberment of society, and proclaimed the maxim of *laissez faire* as the highest political wisdom. A reaction against this tendency was justified, and socialism, in as far as it can be viewed as a protest against extreme individualism, is perfectly right. But socialism, on its part, goes to the other extreme, considering only the social aspect of man, and disregarding the freedom and independence of the individual. It deprives the individual of his liberty, by making him the slave of the community—a wheel in the great and complicated mechanism of the social production, —which is no less absurd.

As in most cases, here too the truth is midway between both extremes. Both aspects of man —the individual as well as the social—must be taken into consideration and brought into harmony. This is the unshaken principle from which all rational attempts at social reform must proceed. The institution and promotion of co-operative organizations are, as we have already noticed, the surest and best means to reconcile the claims of the individual with those of society, and thus to bring about harmony between the conflicting elements.

The most important and indispensable factor in the social reform, however, is the *revival of Christianity* among all classes of society. Legislative measures may produce the external frame-work of a

new social order; but it is only Christianity that can give it life and efficacy. Only on the ground of Christianity can the hostile social elements be brought to a reconciliation. Let us not deceive ourselves: the wisest and most humane legislation will never appease an indolent and grasping mass of laborers. But whence is the laborer to appropriate the virtues of industry and economy? Only from the ever-flowing fountain of living Christianity. How can the laborer be expected to bear the toils and hardships that are inseparable from his state, if he has been led to believe that all hopes and fears in regard to the eternal retribution beyond the grave are childish fancies, and that with this life all shall come to an end?

This revival of Christianity, however, must not be confined to the laborer: it must also extend to the higher and more influential phases of society. In vain will our so-called "cultured classes" expect Christian patience and resignation from the laborer, while they themselves disregard the laws of Christianity, and publicly profess the grossest infidelity. It sounds like irony if the rich preach economy and self-denial to the poor, while they themselves indulge in the most extravagant luxury and dissipation. The wealthy must begin the social reform at home. They must come to the conviction that they have not only rights but also *duties* towards the laboring man—duties of *justice* and duties of *charity*. They must bear in mind that they have been appointed by God, as it were, the administrators of their earthly possessions, which should in some way serve for the benefit of all. They should remember that the laborer is not a mere chattel, but a rational

being, their brother in Christ, who, in the eyes of God, is equal to the richest and most powerful on earth. It is only this bond of Christian sentiment—of mutual love and reverence between rich and poor, high and low—that can bring about a reconciliation of the social conflicts of our times.

And since the Church is the God-appointed guardian and preserver of the Christian religion, and since she cannot fulfil this task unless she is free to exercise all her power and influence, we must demand for the solution of the social problem *the perfect freedom of the Church* in all her ministrations. Above all, we must insist on the full freedom of the Church to exercise her saving influence on the schools, from the common school to the university. Liberalism has used the schools and universities to alienate the nations from God. Socialism is adopting the same policy for the subversion of the social order; and if the Church is to exert her influence for the salvation of society in our day, she must do so chiefly on the field of education.

APPENDIX.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR HOLY FATHER POPE LEO XIII.

ON THE

CONDITION OF LABOR.

TO OUR VENERABLE BRETHREN, ALL PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, AND BISHOPS OF THE CATHOLIC WORLD, IN PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE.

Venerable Brethren, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

It is not surprising that the spirit of revolutionary change, which has so long been predominant in the nations of the world, should have passed beyond politics, and made its influence felt in the cognate field of practical economy. The elements of a conflict are unmistakable: the growth of industry, and the surprising discoveries of science; the changed relations of masters and workmen; the enormous fortunes of individuals, and the poverty of the masses; the increased self-reliance and the closer mutual combination of the working population; and, finally, a general moral deterioration. The momentous seriousness of the present state of things just now fills every mind with painful apprehension; wise men discuss it; practical men propose schemes; popular meetings, legislatures, and sovereign princes,—all are occupied with it, and there is nothing which has a deeper hold on public attention.

Therefore, Venerable Brethren, as on former occasions, when it seemed opportune to refute false teaching, We have addressed you in the interest of the Church and of the common weal, and have issued Letters on Political Power,

on Human Liberty, on the Christian Constitution of the State, and on similar subjects, so now We have thought it useful to speak on the CONDITION OF LABOR. It is a matter on which We have touched once or twice already. But in this Letter the responsibility of the Apostolic office urges Us to treat the question expressly and at length, in order that there may be no mistake as to the principles which truth and justice dictate for its settlement. The discussion is not easy, nor is it free from danger. It is not easy to define the relative rights and the mutual duties of the wealthy and of the poor, of capital and of labor. And the danger lies in this, that crafty agitators constantly make use of these disputes to pervert men's judgments and to stir up the people to sedition.

But all agree, and there can be no question whatever, that some remedy must be found, and quickly found, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on the large majority of the very poor. The ancient workmen's Guilds were destroyed in the last century, and no other organization took their place. Public institutions and the laws have repudiated the ancient religion. Hence by degrees it has come to pass that Working Men have been given over, isolated and defenceless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition. The evil has been increased by rapacious Usury, which, although more than once condemned by the Church, is, nevertheless, under a different form, but with the same guilt, still practised by avaricious and grasping men. And to this must be added the custom of working by contract, and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals, so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself.

To remedy these evils the *Socialists*, working on the poor man's envy of the rich, endeavor to destroy private property, and maintain that individual possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the State or by municipal bodies. They hold that, by thus transferring property from private persons to the community, the present

evil state of things will be set to rights, because each citizen will then have his equal share of whatever there is to enjoy. But their proposals are so clearly futile for all practical purposes, that if they were carried out the working man himself would be among the first to suffer. Moreover they are emphatically unjust, because they would rob the lawful possessor, bring the State into a sphere that is not its own, and cause complete confusion in the community.

It is surely undeniable that, when a man engages in remunerative labor, the very reason and motive of his work is to obtain property, and to hold it as his own private possession. If one man hires out to another his strength or his industry, he does this for the purpose of receiving in return what is necessary for food and living; he thereby expressly proposes to acquire a full and real right, not only to the remuneration, but also to the disposal of that remuneration as he pleases. Thus, if he lives sparingly, saves money, and invests his savings, for greater security, in land, the land in such a case is only his wages in another form; and, consequently, a working man's little estate thus purchased should be as completely at his own disposal as the wages he receives for his labor. But it is precisely in this power of disposal that ownership consists, whether the property be land or movable goods. The *Socialists*, therefore, in endeavoring to transfer the possessions of individuals to the community, strike at the interests of every wage-earner, for they deprive him of the liberty of disposing of his wages, and thus of all hope and possibility of increasing his stock and of bettering his condition in life.

What is of still greater importance, however, is that the remedy they propose is manifestly against justice. For every man has by nature the right to possess property as his own. This is one of the chief points of distinction between man and the animal creation. For the brute has no power of self-direction, but is governed by two chief instincts, which keep his powers alert, move him to use his strength, and determine him to action without the power of choice. These instincts are self-preservation and the propagation of the species. Both can attain their purpose by means of things which are

close at hand ; beyond their surroundings the brute creation cannot go, for they are moved to action by sensibility alone, and by the things which sense perceives. But with man it is different indeed. He possesses, on the one hand, the full perfection of animal nature, and therefore he enjoys, at least as much as the rest of the animal race, the fruition of the things of the body. But animality, however perfect, is far from being the whole of humanity, and is, indeed, humanity's humble handmaid, made to serve and obey. It is the mind, or the reason, which is the chief thing in us who are human beings ; it is this which makes a human being human, and distinguishes him essentially and completely from the brute. And on this account—viz., that man alone among animals possesses reason—it must be within his right to have things not merely for temporary and momentary use, as other living beings have them, but in stable and permanent possession ; he must have not only things which perish in the using, but also those which, though used, remain for use in the future.

This becomes still more clearly evident if we consider man's nature a little more deeply. For man, comprehending by the power of his reason things innumerable, and joining the future with the present—being, moreover, the master of his own acts—governs himself by the foresight of his counsel, under the eternal law and the power of God whose Providence governs all things. Wherefore it is in his power to exercise his choice, not only on things which regard his present welfare, but also on those which will be for his advantage in time to come. Hence man not only can possess the fruits of the earth, but also the earth itself; for of the products of the earth he can make provision for the future. Man's needs do not die out, but recur ; satisfied to-day, they demand new supplies to-morrow. Nature, therefore, owes to man a storehouse that shall never fail, the daily supply of his daily wants. And this he finds only in the inexhaustible fertility of the earth.

Nor must we, at this stage, have recourse to the State. Man is older than the State ; and he holds the right of providing for the life of his body prior to the formation of any

State. And to say that God has given the earth to the use and enjoyment of the universal human race is not to deny that there can be private property. For God has granted the earth to mankind in general; not in the sense that all without distinction can deal with it as they please, but rather that no part of it has been assigned to any one in particular, and that the limits of private possession have been left to be fixed by man's own industry and the laws of individual peoples. Moreover, the earth, though divided among private owners, ceases not thereby to minister to the needs of all; for there is no one who does not live on what the land brings forth. Those who do not possess the soil, contribute their labor; so that it may be truly said that all human subsistence is derived either from labor on one's own land, or from some laborious industry which is paid for either in the produce of the land itself or in that which is exchanged for what the land brings forth.

Here, again, we have another proof that private ownership is according to nature's law. For that which is required for the preservation of life, and for life's well-being, is produced in great abundance by the earth, but not until man has brought it into cultivation and lavished upon it his care and skill. Now, when man thus spends the industry of his mind and the strength of his body in procuring the fruits of nature, by that act he makes his own that portion of nature's field which he cultivates—that portion on which he leaves, as it were, the impress of his own personality; and it cannot but be just that he should possess that portion as his own, and should have a right to keep it without molestation.

These arguments are so strong and convincing that it seems surprising that certain obsolete opinions should now be revived in opposition to what is here laid down. We are told that it is right for private persons to have the use the soil and the fruits of their land, but that it is unjust for any one to possess as owner either the land on which he has built or the estate which he has cultivated. But those who assert this do not perceive that they are robbing man of what his own labor has produced. For the soil which is tilled and cultivated with toil and skill utterly

changes its condition; it was wild before, it is now fruitful; it was barren, and now it brings forth in abundance. That which has thus altered and improved it becomes so truly part of itself as to be in great measure indistinguishable and inseparable from it. Is it just that the fruit of a man's sweat and labor should be enjoyed by another? As effects follow their cause, so it is just and right that the results of labor should belong to him who has labored.

With reason, therefore, the common opinion of mankind, little affected by the few dissentients who have maintained the opposite view, has found in the study of nature, and in the law of Nature herself, the foundations of the division of property, and has consecrated by the practice of all ages the principle of private ownership, as being preëminently in conformity with human nature, and as conducing, in the most unmistakable manner, to the peace and tranquillity of human life. The same principle is confirmed and enforced by the civil laws,—laws which, as long as they are just, derive their binding force from the law of nature. The authority of the Divine Law adds its sanction, forbidding us, in the gravest terms, even to covet that which is another's: *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife; nor his house, nor his field, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything which is his.**

The rights here spoken of, belonging to each individual man, are seen in a much stronger light if they are considered in relation to man's social and domestic obligations.

In choosing a state of life, it is indisputable that all are at full liberty either to follow the counsel of Jesus Christ as to virginity, or to enter into the bonds of marriage. No human law can abolish the natural and primitive right of marriage, or in any way limit the chief and principal purpose of marriage, ordained by God's authority from the beginning. *Increase and multiply.*† Thus we have the Family; the "society" of a man's own household; a society limited, indeed, in numbers, but a true "society," anterior to every kind of State or nation, with rights and duties of its own, totally independent of the commonwealth.

* Deuteronomy v. 21. † Genesis i. 28.

That right of property, therefore, which has been proved to belong naturally to individual persons, must also belong to a man in his capacity of head of a family; nay, such a person must possess this right so much the more clearly in proportion as his position multiplies his duties. For it is a most sacred law of nature that a father must provide food and all necessaries for those whom he has begotten; and, similarly, nature dictates that a man's children, who carry on, as it were, and continue his own personality, should be provided by him with all that is needful to enable them honorably to keep themselves from want and misery in the uncertainties of this mortal life. Now, in no other way can a father effect this except by the ownership of profitable property, which he can transmit to his children by inheritance. A family, no less than a State, is, as We have said, a true society, governed by a power within itself, that is to say, by the father. Wherefore, provided the limits be not transgressed which are prescribed by the very purposes for which it exists, the Family has, at least, equal rights with the State in the choice and pursuit of those things which are needful to its preservation and its just liberty.

We say, at least, equal rights; for since the domestic household is anterior both in idea and in fact to the gathering of men into a commonwealth, the former must necessarily have rights and duties which are prior to those of the latter, and which rest more immediately on nature. If the citizens of a State—that is to say, the Families—on entering into association and fellowship, experienced at the hands of the State hindrance instead of help, and found their rights attacked instead of being protected, such association were rather to be repudiated than sought after.

The idea, then, that the civil government should, at its own discretion, penetrate and pervade the family and the household, is a great and pernicious mistake. True, if a family finds itself in great difficulty, utterly friendless, and without prospect of help, it is right that extreme necessity be met by public aid; for each family is a part of the commonwealth. In like manner, if within the walls of the household there occur grave disturbance of mutual rights, the public power

must interfere to force each party to give the other what is due; for this is not to rob citizens of their rights, but justly and properly to safeguard and strengthen them. But the rulers of the State must go no further: nature bids them stop here. Paternal authority can neither be abolished by the State, nor absorbed; for it has the same source as human life itself. "The child belongs to the father," and is, as it were, the continuation of the father's personality; and, to speak with strictness, the child takes its place in civil society not in its own right, but in its quality as a member of the family in which it is begotten. And it is for the very reason that "the child belongs to the father," that, as St. Thomas of Aquin says, "before it attains the use of free will, it is in the power and care of its parents."* The Socialists, therefore, in setting aside the parent and introducing the providence of the State, act *against natural justice*, and threaten the very existence of family life.

And such interference is not only unjust, but is quite certain to harass and disturb all classes of citizens, and to subject them to odious and intolerable slavery. It would open the door to envy, to evil-speaking, and to quarrelling; the sources of wealth would themselves run dry, for no one would have any interest in exerting his talents or his industry; and that ideal equality of which so much is said would, in reality, be the levelling down of all to the same condition of misery and dishonor.

Thus it is clear that the main tenet of *Socialism*, the community of goods, must be utterly rejected; for it would injure those whom it is intended to benefit, it would be contrary to the natural rights of mankind, and it would introduce confusion and disorder into the commonwealth. Our first and most fundamental principle, therefore, when we undertake to alleviate the condition of the masses, must be the inviolability of private property. This laid down, We go on to show where we must find the remedy that we seek.

We approach the subject with confidence, and in the exercise of the rights which belong to Us. For no practical solution of this question will ever be found without the

* St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, 2a 2æ Q. x. Art. 12.

assistance of Religion and of the Church. It is We who are the chief guardian of Religion, and the chief dispenser of what belongs to the Church, and We must not by silence neglect the duty which lies upon Us. Doubtless this most serious question demands the attention and the efforts of others besides Ourselves—of the rulers of States, of employers of labor, of the wealthy, and of the working population themselves for whom We plead. But We affirm without hesitation, that all the striving of men will be vain if they leave out the Church. It is the Church that proclaims from the Gospel those teachings by which the conflict can be put an end to, or at the least made far less bitter; the Church uses its efforts not only to enlighten the mind, but to direct by its precepts the life and conduct of men; the Church improves and ameliorates the condition of the working man by numerous useful organizations; does its best to enlist the services of all ranks in discussing and endeavoring to meet, in the most practical way, the claims of the working classes; and acts on the decided view that for these purposes recourse should be had, in due measure and degree, to the help of the law and of State authority.

Let it be laid down, in the first place, that humanity must remain as it is. It is impossible to reduce human society to a level. The *Socialists* may do their utmost, but all striving against nature is vain. There naturally exist among mankind innumerable differences of the most important kind; people differ in capability, in diligence, in health, and in strength; an unequal fortune is a necessary result of inequality in condition. Such inequality is far from being disadvantageous either to individuals or to the community; social and public life can only go on by the help of various kinds of capacity and the playing of many parts; and each man, as a rule, chooses the part which peculiarly suits his case. As regards bodily labor, even had man never fallen from *the state of innocence*, he would not have been wholly unoccupied; but that which would then have been his free choice and his delight, became afterwards compulsory, and the painful expiation of his sin. *Cursed be the earth in thy work; in thy labor thou shalt eat of it all the days of thy*

*life.** In like manner, the other pains and hardships of life will have no end or cessation on this earth; for the consequences of sin are bitter and hard to bear, and they must be with man as long as life lasts. To suffer and to endure, therefore, is the lot of humanity; let men try as they may, no strength and no artifice will ever succeed in banishing from human life the ills and troubles which beset it. If any there are who pretend differently—who hold out to a hard-pressed people freedom from pain and trouble, undisturbed repose, and constant enjoyment—they cheat the people and impose upon them, and their lying promises will only make the evil worse than before. There is nothing more useful than to look at the world as it really is—and at the same time to look elsewhere for a remedy to its troubles.

The great mistake that is made in the matter now under consideration, is to possess oneself of the idea that class is naturally hostile to class; that rich and poor are intended by nature to live at war with one another. So irrational and so false is this view, that the exact contrary is the truth. Just as the symmetry of the human body is the result of the disposition of the members of the body, so in a State it is ordained by nature that these two classes should exist in harmony and agreement, and should, as it were, fit into one another, so as to maintain the equilibrium of the body politic. Each requires the other; capital cannot do without labor, nor labor without capital. Mutual agreement results in pleasantness and good order; perpetual conflict necessarily produces confusion and outrage. Now, in preventing such strife as this, and in making it impossible, the efficacy of Christianity is marvellous and manifold. First of all, there is nothing more powerful than Religion (of which the Church is the interpreter and guardian) in drawing rich and poor together, by reminding each class of its duties to the other, and especially of the duties of justice. Thus Religion teaches the laboring man and the workman to carry out honestly and well all equitable agreements freely made; never to injure capital, or to outrage the person of an employer; never to employ violence in representing his own

* Genesis iii. 17.

cause, or to engage in riot or disorder; and to have nothing to do with men of evil principles, who work upon the people with artful promises, and raise foolish hopes which usually end in disaster and in repentance when too late. Religion teaches the rich man and the employer that their work-people are not their slaves; that they must respect in every man his dignity as a man and as a Christian; that labor is nothing to be ashamed of, if we listen to right reason, and to Christian philosophy, but is an honorable employment, enabling a man to sustain his life in an upright and creditable way; and that it is shameful and inhuman to treat men like chattels to make money by, or to look upon them merely as so much muscle or physical power. Thus, again, Religion teaches that, as among the workman's concerns are Religion herself and things spiritual and mental, the employer is bound to see that he has time for the duties of piety; that he be not exposed to corrupting influences and dangerous occasions; and that he be not led away to neglect his home and family or to squander his wages. Then, again, the employer must never tax his work-people beyond their strength, nor employ them in work unsuited to their sex or age. His great and principal obligation is to give to every one that which is just. Doubtless before we can decide whether wages are adequate, many things have to be considered; but rich men and masters should remember this—that to exercise pressure for the sake of gain, upon the indigent and the destitute, and to make one's profit out of the need of another, is condemned by all laws, human and divine. To defraud any one of wages that are his due is a crime which cries to the avenging anger of heaven. *Behold the hire of the laborers . . . which by fraud hath been kept back by you, crieth; and the cry of them hath entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.** Finally, the rich must religiously refrain from cutting down the workman's earnings, either by force, by fraud, or by usurious dealing; and with the more reason because the poor man is weak and unprotected, and because his slender means should be sacred in proportion to their scantiness.

* St. James v. 4.

Were these precepts carefully obeyed and followed, would not strife die out and cease?

But the Church, with Jesus Christ for its Master and Guide, aims higher still. It lays down precepts yet more perfect, and tries to bind class to class in friendliness and good understanding. The things of this earth cannot be understood or valued rightly without taking into consideration the life to come, the life that will last forever. Exclude the idea of futurity, and the very notion of what is good and right would perish; nay, the whole system of the universe would become a dark and unfathomable mystery. The great truth which we learn from Nature herself is also the grand Christian dogma on which Religion rests as on its base—that when we have done with this present life, then we shall really begin to live. God has not created us for the perishable and transitory things of earth, but for things heavenly and everlasting; He has given us this world as a place of exile, and not as our true country. Money, and the other things which men call good and desirable—we may have them in abundance, or we may want them altogether; as far as eternal happiness is concerned, it is no matter; the only thing that is important is to use them aright. Jesus Christ, when He redeemed us with *plentiful redemption*, took not away the pains and sorrows which in such large proportion make up the texture of our mortal life; He transformed them into motives of virtue and occasions of merit: and no man can hope for eternal reward unless he follow in the blood-stained footprints of his Saviour. *If we suffer with Him, we shall also reign with Him.** His labors and His sufferings, accepted by His own free will, have marvellously sweetened all suffering and all labor. And not only by His example, but by His grace and by the hope of everlasting recompense, He has made pain and grief more easy to endure; *for that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation, worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory.*†

Therefore those whom fortune favors are warned that freedom from sorrow, and abundance of earthly riches, are no

* II. Timothy ii. 12. † II. Corinthians iv. 17.

guarantee of the beatitude that shall never end, but rather the contrary;* that the rich should tremble at the threatenings of Jesus Christ—threatenings so strange in the mouth of Our Lord;† and that a most strict account must be given to the Supreme Judge for all that we possess. The chiefest and most excellent rule for the right use of money is one which the heathen philosophers indicated, but which the Church has traced out clearly, and has not only made known to men's minds but has impressed upon their lives. It rests on the principle that it is one thing to have a right to the possession of money, and another to have a right to use money as one pleases. Private ownership, as we have seen, is the natural right of man; and to exercise that right, especially as members of society, is not only lawful, but absolutely necessary. *It is lawful*, says St. Thomas of Aquin, *for a man to hold private property; and it is also necessary for the carrying on of human life.*‡ But if the question be asked, How must one's possessions be used? the Church replies without hesitation in the words of the same holy Doctor: *Man should not consider his outward possessions as his own, but as common to all, so as to share them without difficulty when others are in need. Whence the Apostle saith, Command the rich of this world . . . to give with ease, to communicate.*§ True, no one is commanded to distribute to others that which is required for his own necessities and those of his household; nor even to give away what is reasonably required to keep up becomingly his condition in life; *for no one ought to live unbecomingly.*‖ But when necessity has been supplied, and one's position fairly considered, it is a duty to give to the indigent out of that which is over. *That which remaineth, give alms.*¶ It is a duty, not of justice (except in extreme cases), but of Christian charity —a duty which is not enforced by human law. But the laws and judgments of men must give place to the laws and judgments of Christ the true God, Who in many ways urges on His followers the practice of almsgiving—*It is more blessed to*

* St. Matthew xix. 23, 24.
† St. Luke vi. 24, 25.
‡ 2a 2æ Q. lxvi. Art. 2.
§ *Ibid.* Q. lxv. Art. 2.
‖ *Ibid.* Q. xxxii. Art. 6.
¶ St. Luke xi. 41.

give than to receive ; * and Who will count a kindness done or refused to the poor as done or refused to Himself—*as long as you did it to one of My least brethren, you did it to Me.*† Thus to sum up what has been said: Whoever has received from the Divine bounty a large share of blessings, whether they be external and corporeal or gifts of the mind, has received them for the purpose of using them for the perfecting of his own nature, and, at the same time, that he may employ them, as the minister of God's providence, for the benefit of others. *He that hath a talent*, says St. Gregory the Great, *let him see that he hide it not ; he that hath abundance, let him arouse himself to mercy and generosity ; he that hath art and skill, let him do his best to share the use and the utility thereof with his neighbor.*‡

As for those who do not possess the gifts of fortune, they are taught by the Church that in God's sight poverty is no disgrace, and that there is nothing to be ashamed of in seeking one's bread by labor. This is strengthened by what we see in Christ Himself, Who *whereas He was rich, for our sakes became poor ;*§ and Who, being the Son of God, and God Himself, chose to seem and to be considered the son of a carpenter—nay, did not disdain to spend a great part of His life as a carpenter Himself. *Is not this the carpenter, the Son of Mary ?*‖ From the contemplation of this Divine example it is easy to understand that the true dignity and excellence of man lies in his moral qualities, that is, in virtue; that virtue is the common inheritance of all, equally within the reach of high and low, rich and poor; and that virtue, and virtue alone, wherever found, will be followed by the rewards of everlasting happiness. Nay, God Himself seems to incline more to those who suffer evil; for Jesus Christ calls the poor blessed ;¶ He lovingly invites those in labor and grief to come to Him for solace;** and He displays the tender-

* Acts xx. 35. † St. Matthew xxv. 40.
‡ St. Gregory the Great. Hom, ix. *in Evangel.* n. 7.
§ II. Corinthians viii. 9. ‖ St. Mark vi. 3.
¶ St. Matthew v. 3 : "*Blessed are the poor in spirit.*"
** *Ibid.* xi. 28. "*Come to Me, all you that labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you.*"

est charity to the lowly and the oppressed. These reflections cannot fail to keep down the pride of those who are well off, and to cheer the spirit of the afflicted; to incline the former to generosity and the latter to tranquil resignation. Thus the separation which pride would make tends to disappear, nor will it be difficult to make rich and poor join hands in friendly concord.

But if Christian precepts prevail, the two classes will not only be united in the bonds of friendship, but also in those of brotherly love. For they will understand and feel that all men are the children of the common Father, that is, of God; that all have the same last end, which is God Himself, Who alone can make either men or angels absolutely and perfectly happy; that all and each are redeemed by Jesus Christ and raised to the dignity of children of God, and are thus united in brotherly ties both with each other and with Jesus Christ, *the first-born among many brethren;* that the blessings of nature and the gifts of grace belong in common to the whole human race, and that to all, except to those who are unworthy, is promised the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven. *If sons, heirs also; heirs indeed of God, and co-heirs of Christ.**

Such is the scheme of duties and of rights which is put forth to the world by the Gospel. Would it not seem that strife must quickly cease were society penetrated with ideas like these?

But the Church, not content with pointing out the remedy, also applies it. For the Church does its utmost to teach and to train men, and to educate them; and by means of its Bishops and clergy it diffuses its salutary teachings far and wide. It strives to influence the mind and heart so that all may willingly yield themselves to be formed and guided by the commandments of God. It is precisely in this fundamental and principal matter, on which everything depends, that the Church has a power peculiar to itself. The agencies which it employs are given it for the very purpose of reaching the hearts of men, by Jesus Christ Himself, and derive their efficiency from God. They alone can touch the inner-

* Romans viii. 17.

most heart and conscience, and bring men to act from a motive of duty, to resist their passions and appetites, to love God and their fellow-men with a love that is unique and supreme, and courageously to break down every barrier which stands in the way of a virtuous life.

On this subject We need only recall, for one moment, the examples written down in history. Of these things there cannot be the shadow of doubt; for instance, that civil society was renovated in every part by the teachings of Christianity; that in the strength of that renewal the human race was lifted up to better things,—nay, that it was brought back from death to life, and to so excellent a life that nothing more perfect had been known before, or will come to pass in the ages that have yet to be. Of this beneficent transformation, Jesus Christ was at once the first cause and the final purpose; as from Him all came, so to Him all was to be referred. For when, by the light of the Gospel message, the human race came to know the grand mystery of the Incarnation of the Word and the redemption of man, the life of Jesus Christ, God and Man, penetrated every race and nation, and impregnated them with His faith, His precepts, and His laws. And if Society is to be cured now, in no other way can it be cured but by a return to the Christian life and Christian institutions. When a society is perishing, the true advice to give to those who would restore it is to recall it to the principles from which it sprung; for the purpose and perfection of an association is to aim at and to attain that for which it was formed; and its operation should be put in motion and inspired by the end and object which originally gave it its being. So that to fall away from its primal constitution is disease; to go back to it is recovery. And this may be asserted with the utmost truth both of the State in general and of that body of its citizens—by far the greater number—who sustain life by labor.

Neither must it be supposed that the solicitude of the Church is so occupied with the spiritual concerns of its children as to neglect their interests temporal and earthly. Its desire is that the poor, for example, should rise above poverty and wretchedness, and should better their condition

in life; and for this it strives. By the very fact that it calls men to virtue and forms them to its practice, it promotes this in no slight degree. Christian morality, when it is adequately and completely practised, conduces of itself to temporal prosperity, for it merits the blessing of that God Who is the source of all blessings; it powerfully restrains the lust of possession and the lust of pleasure—twin plagues, which too often make a man without self-restraint miserable in the midst of abundance;* it makes men supply by economy for the want of means, teaching them to be content with frugal living, and keeping them out of the reach of those vices which eat up not merely small incomes, but large fortunes, and dissipate many a goodly inheritance.

Moreover, the Church intervenes directly in the interest of the poor, by setting on foot and keeping up many things which it sees to be efficacious in the relief of poverty. Here, again, it has always succeeded so well that it has even extorted the praise of its enemies. Such was the ardor of brotherly love among the earliest Christians that numbers of those who were better off deprived themselves of their possessions in order to relieve their brethren; whence *neither was there any one needy among them.*† To the order of Deacons, instituted for that very purpose, was committed by the Apostles the charge of the daily distributions; and the Apostle Paul, though burdened with the solicitude of all the churches, hesitated not to undertake laborious journeys in order to carry the alms of the Faithful to the poorer Christians. Tertullian calls these contributions, given voluntarily by Christians in their assemblies, *deposits of piety;* because, to cite his words, they were employed *in feeding the needy, in burying them, in the support of boys and girls destitute of means and deprived of their parents, in the care of the aged, and in relief of the shipwrecked.*‡

Thus by degrees came into existence the patrimony which the Church has guarded with religious care as the inheritance of the poor. Nay, to spare them the shame of begging,

* "*The root of all evils is cupidity.*"—I. Tim. vi. 10.

† Acts iv. 34. ‡ *Apologia Secunda*, xxxix.

the common Mother of rich and poor has exerted herself to gather together funds for the support of the needy. The Church has stirred up everywhere the heroism of charity, and has established Congregations of Religious and many other useful institutions for help and mercy, so that there might be hardly any kind of suffering which was not visited and relieved. At the present day there are many who, like the heathen of old, blame and condemn the Church for this beautiful charity. They would substitute in its place a system of State-organized relief. But no human methods will ever supply for the devotion and self-sacrifice of Christian charity. Charity, as a virtue, belongs to the Church; for it is no virtue unless it is drawn from the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ; and he who turns his back on the Church cannot be near to Christ.

It cannot, however, be doubted that to attain the purpose of which We treat, not only the Church but all human means must conspire. All who are concerned in the matter must be of one mind and must act together. It is in this as in the Providence which governs the world: results do not happen save where all the causes co-operate.

Let us now, therefore, inquire what part the State should play in the work of remedy and relief.

By the State We here understand, not the particular form of government which prevails in this or that nation, but the State, as rightly understood; that is to say, any government conformable in its institutions to right reason and natural law, and to those dictates of the Divine wisdom which We have expounded in the Encyclical on the Christian Constitution of the State. The first duty, therefore, of the rulers of the State should be to make sure that the laws and institutions, the general character and administration of the commonwealth, shall be such as to produce of themselves public well-being and private prosperity. This is the proper office of wise statesmanship and the work of the heads of the State. Now a State chiefly prospers and flourishes by morality, by well-regulated family life, by respect for religion and justice, by the moderation and equal distribution of public burdens, by the progress of the arts and of trade, by the

abundant yield of the land—by everything which makes the citizens better and happier. Here, then, it is in the power of a ruler to benefit every order of the State, and amongst the rest to promote in the highest degree the interests of the poor, and this by virtue of his office, and without being exposed to any suspicion of undue interference; for it is the province of the commonwealth to consult for the common good. And the more that is done for the working population by the general laws of the country, the less need will there be to seek for particular means to relieve them.

There is another and a deeper consideration which must not be lost sight of. To the State the interests of all are equal, whether high or low. The poor are members of the national community equally with the rich; they are real component parts, living parts, which make up, through the family, the living body; and it need hardly be said that they are by far the majority. It would be irrational to neglect one portion of the citizens and to favor another; and therefore the public administration must duly and solicitously provide for the welfare and the comfort of the working people, or else that law of justice will be violated which ordains that each shall have his due. To cite the wise words of St. Thomas of Aquin: *As the part and the whole are in a certain sense identical, the part may in some sense claim what belongs to the whole.** Among the many and grave duties of rulers who would do their best for the people, the first and chief is to act with strict justice—with that justice which is called in the school *distributive*—towards each and every class.

But although all citizens, without exception, can and ought to contribute to that common good in which individuals share so profitably to themselves, yet it is not to be supposed that all can contribute in the same way and to the same extent. No matter what changes may be made in forms of government, there will always be differences and inequalities of condition in the State: Society cannot exist or be conceived without them. Some there must be who dedicate themselves to the work of the commonwealth, who

* 2a 2æ Q. lxi. Art. 1 ad 2.

make the laws, who administer justice, whose advice and authority govern the nation in times of peace, and defend it in war. Such men clearly occupy the foremost place in the State, and should be held in the foremost estimation, for their work touches most nearly and effectively the general interests of the community. Those who labor at a trade or calling do not promote the general welfare in such a fashion as this; but they do in the most important way benefit the nation, though less directly. We have insisted that, since it is the end of Society to make men better, the chief good that Society can be possessed of is Virtue. Nevertheless, in all well-constituted States it is a by no means unimportant matter to provide those bodily and external commodities *the use of which is necessary to virtuous action.** And in the provision of material well-being, the labor of the poor—the exercise of their skill, and the employment of their strength in the culture of the land and the workshops of trade—is most efficacious and altogether indispensable. Indeed, their co-operation in this respect is so important that it may be truly said that it is only by the labor of the working man that States grow rich. Justice, therefore, demands that the interests of the poorer population be carefully watched over by the Administration, so that they who contribute so largely to the advantage of the community may themselves share in the benefits they create—that being housed, clothed, and enabled to support life, they may find their existence less hard and more endurable. It follows that whatever shall appear to be conducive to the well-being of those who work should receive favorable consideration. Let it not be feared that solicitude of this kind will injure any interest; on the contrary, it will be to the advantage of all; for it cannot but be good for the commonwealth to secure from misery those on whom it so largely depends.

We have said that the State must not absorb the individual or the family; both should be allowed free and untrammelled action as far as is consistent with the common good and the interests of others. Nevertheless, rulers should

* St. Thomas of Aquin. *De Regimine Principum*, I. cap. 15.

anxiously safeguard the community and all its parts; the community, because the conservation of the community is so emphatically the business of the supreme power, that the safety of the commonwealth is not only the first law, but it is a Government's whole reason of existence; and the parts, because both philosophy and the Gospel agree in laying down that the object of the administration of the State should be, not the advantage of the ruler, but the benefit of those over whom he rules. The gift of authority is from God, and is, as it were, a participation of the highest of all sovereignties; and it should be exercised as the power of God is exercised—with a fatherly solicitude which not only guides the whole, but reaches to details as well.

Whenever the general interest or any particular class suffers, or is threatened with, evils which can in no other way be met, the public authority must step in to meet them. Now, among the interests of the public, as of private individuals, are these: that peace and good order should be maintained; that family life should be carried on in accordance with God's laws and those of nature; that Religion should be reverenced and obeyed; that a high standard of morality should prevail in public and private life; that the sanctity of justice should be respected, and that no one should injure another with impunity; that the members of the commonwealth should grow up to man's estate strong and robust, and capable, if need be, of guarding and defending their country. If, by a strike or other combination of workmen, there should be imminent danger of disturbance to the public peace, or if circumstances were such that among the laboring population the ties of family life were relaxed; if Religion were found to suffer through the workmen not having time and opportunity to practise it; if in workshops and factories there were danger to morals through the mixing of the sexes or from any occasion of evil, or if employers laid burdens upon the workmen which were unjust, or degraded them with conditions that were repugnant to their dignity as human beings; finally, if health were endangered by excessive labor, or by work unsuited to sex or age—in these cases there can be no question that, within certain

limits, it would be right to call in the help and authority of the law. The limits must be determined by the nature of the occasion which calls for the law's interference—the principle being this, that the law must not undertake more, or go further, than is required for the remedy of the evil or the removal of the danger.

Rights must be religiously respected wherever they are found; and it is the duty of the public authority to prevent and punish injury, and to protect each one in the possession of his own. Still, when there is question of protecting the rights of individuals, the poor and helpless have a claim to special consideration. The richer population have many ways of protecting themselves, and stand less in need of help from the State; those who are badly off have no resources of their own to fall back upon, and must chiefly rely upon the assistance of the State. And it is for this reason that wage-earners, who are undoubtedly among the weak and necessitous, should be specially cared for and protected by the commonwealth.

Here, however, it will be advisable to advert expressly to one or two of the more important details. It must be borne in mind that the chief thing to be secured is the safeguarding, by legal enactment and policy, of private property. Most of all is it essential, in these times of covetous greed, to keep the multitude within the line of duty; for if all may justly strive to better their condition, yet neither justice nor the common good allows any one to seize that which belongs to another, or, under the pretext of futile and ridiculous equality, to lay hands on other people's fortunes. It is most true that by far the larger part of the people who work prefer to improve themselves by honest labor rather than by doing wrong to others. But there are not a few who are imbued with bad principles and are anxious for revolutionary change, and whose great purpose it is to stir up tumult and bring about a policy of violence. The authority of the State should intervene to put restraint upon these disturbers, to save the workmen from their seditious arts, and to protect lawful owners from spoliation.

When work-people have recourse to a strike, it is frequently because the hours of labor are too long, or the work

too hard, or because they consider their wages insufficient. The grave inconvenience of this not uncommon occurrence should be obviated by public remedial measures; for such paralysis of labor not only affects the masters and their work-people, but is extremely injurious to trade, and to the general interests of the public; moreover, on such occasions, violence and disorder are generally not far off, and thus it frequently happens that the public peace is threatened. The law should be beforehand and prevent these troubles from arising; they should lend their influence and authority to the removal in good time of the causes which lead to conflicts between masters and those whom they employ.

But if the owners of property must be made secure, the Workman, too, has property and possessions in which he must be protected; and, first of all, there are his spiritual and mental interests. Life on earth, however good and desirable in itself, is not the final purpose for which man is created; it is only the way and the means to that attainment of truth, and that practice of goodness, in which the full life of the soul consists. It is the soul which is made after the image and likeness of God; it is in the soul that sovereignty resides, in virtue of which man is commanded to rule the creatures below him, and to use all the earth and the ocean for his profit and advantage. *Fill the earth and subdue it; and rule over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and all living creatures which move upon the earth.** In this respect all men are equal; there is no difference between rich and poor, master and servant, ruler and ruled, *for the same is Lord over all.*† No man may outrage with impunity that human dignity which God Himself treats *with reverence*, nor stand in the way of that higher life which is the preparation for the eternal life of heaven. Nay, more; a man has here no power over himself. To consent to any treatment which is calculated to defeat the end and purpose of his being is beyond his right; he cannot give up his soul to servitude; for it is not man's own rights which are here in question, but the rights of God, most sacred and inviolable.

* Genesis i. 28. † Romans x. 12.

From this follows the obligation of the cessation of work and labor on Sundays and certain festivals. This rest from labor is not to be understood as mere idleness; much less must it be an occasion of spending money and of vicious excess, as many would desire it to be; but it should be rest from labor consecrated by religion. Repose united with religious observance disposes man to forget for a while the business of this daily life, and to turn his thoughts to heavenly things and to the worship which he so strictly owes to the Eternal Deity. It is this, above all, which is the reason and motive of the Sunday rest; a rest sanctioned by God's great law of the ancient covenant, *Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day*,* and taught to the world by His own mysterious "rest" after the creation of man: *He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done*.†

If we turn now to things exterior and corporeal, the first concern of all is to save the poor workers from the cruelty of grasping speculators, who use human beings as mere instruments for making money. It is neither justice nor humanity so to grind men down with excessive labor as to stupefy their minds and wear out their bodies. Man's powers, like his general nature, are limited, and beyond these limits he cannot go. His strength is developed and increased by use and exercise, but only on condition of due intermission and proper rest. Daily labor, therefore, must be so regulated that it may not be protracted during longer hours than strength admits. How many and how long the intervals of rest should be will depend on the nature of the work, on circumstances of time and place, and on the health and strength of the workman. Those who labor in mines and quarries, and in work within the bowels of the earth, should have shorter hours in proportion as their labor is more severe and more trying to health. Then, again, the season of the year must be taken into account; for not unfrequently a kind of labor is easy at one time which at another is intolerable or very difficult. Finally, work which is suitable for a strong man cannot reasonably be required from a woman or a child. And, in regard to children, great care should be

* Exod. xx. 8. † Genesis ii. 2.

taken not to place them in workshops and factories until their bodies and minds are sufficiently mature. For just as rough weather destroys the buds of spring, so too early an experience of life's hard work blights the young promise of a child's powers, and makes any real education impossible. Women, again, are not suited to certain trades; for a woman is by nature fitted for home-work, and it is that which is best adapted at once to preserve her modesty and to promote the good bringing up of children and the well-being of the family. As a general principle it may be laid down, that a workman ought to have leisure and rest in proportion to the wear and tear of his strength; for the waste of strength must be repaired by the cessation of work.

In all agreements between masters and work-people, there is always the condition, expressed or understood, that there be allowed proper rest for soul and body. To agree in any other sense would be against what is right and just; for it can never be right or just to require on the one side, or to promise on the other, the giving up of those duties which a man owes to his God and to himself.

We now approach a subject of very great importance, and one on which, if extremes are to be avoided, right ideas are absolutely necessary. Wages, we are told, are fixed by free consent; and therefore the employer, when he pays what was agreed upon, has done his part, and is not called upon for anything further. The only way, it is said, in which injustice could happen would be if the master refused to pay the whole of the wages, or the workman would not complete the work undertaken; when this happens the State should intervene, to see that each obtains his own—but not under any other circumstances.

This mode of reasoning is by no means convincing to a fair-minded man, for there are important considerations which it leaves out of view altogether. To labor is to exert one's self for the sake of procuring what is necessary for the purposes of life, and most of all for self-preservation. *In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread.** Therefore a man's labor has two notes or characters. First of all, it is

* Genesis iii. 19.

personal; for the exertion of individual power belongs to the individual who puts it forth, employing this power for that personal profit for which it was given. Secondly, man's labor is *necessary;* for without the results of labor a man cannot live; and self-conservation is a law of nature which it is wrong to disobey. Now if we were to consider labor merely so far as it is *personal,* doubtless it would be within the workman's right to accept any rate of wages whatever; for in the same way as he is free to work or not, so he is free to accept a small remuneration or even none at all. But this is a mere abstract supposition; the labor of the working man is not only his personal attribute, but it is *necessary;* and this makes all the difference. The preservation of life is the bounden duty of each and all, and to fail therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to procure what is required in order to live; and the poor can procure it in no other way than by work and wages.

Let it be granted, then, that as a rule, workman and employer should make free agreements, and in particular should freely agree as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil, the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or a contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice. In these and similar questions, however—such as, for example, the hours of labor in different trades, the sanitary precautions to be observed in factories and workshops, etc.—in order to supersede undue interference on the part of the State, especially as circumstances, times, and localities differ so widely, it is advisable that recourse be had to Societies or Boards such as We shall mention presently, or to some other method of safe-guarding the interests of wage-earners; the State to be asked for approval and protection.

If a workman's wages be sufficient to enable him to maintain himself, his wife, and his children in reasonable comfort, he will not find it difficult, if he is a sensible man, to study

economy; and he will not fail, by cutting down expenses, to put by a little property; nature and reason would urge him to this. We have seen that this great Labor question cannot be solved except by assuming as a principle that private ownership must be held sacred and inviolable. The law, therefore, should favor ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many of the people as possible to become owners.

Many excellent results will follow from this; and first of all, property will certainly become more equitably divided. For the effect of civil change and revolution has been to divide society into two widely differing castes. On the one side there is the party which holds the power because it holds the wealth; which has in its grasp all labor and all trade, which manipulates for its own benefit and its own purposes all the sources of supply, and which is powerfully represented in the councils of the State itself. On the other side there is the needy and powerless multitude, sore and suffering, and always ready for disturbance. If working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the result will be that the gulf between vast wealth and deep poverty will be bridged over, and the two orders will be brought nearer together. Another consequence will be the greater abundance of the fruits of the earth. Men always work harder and more readily when they work on that which is their own; nay, they learn to love the very soil which yields in response to the labor of their hands, not only food to eat, but an abundance of good things for themselves and those that are dear to them. It is evident how such a spirit of willing labor would add to the produce of the earth, and to the wealth of the community. And a third advantage would arise from this; men would cling to the country in which they were born; for no one would exchange his country for a foreign land if his own afforded him the means of living a tolerable and happy life. These three important benefits, however, can only be expected on the condition that a man's means be not drained and exhausted by excessive taxation. The right to possess private property is from nature, not from man; and the State has

only the right to regulate its use in the interests of the public good, but by no means to abolish it altogether. The State is, therefore, unjust and cruel if, in the name of taxation, it deprives the private owner of more than is just.

In the last place—employers and workmen may themselves effect much in the matter of which We treat, by means of those institutions and organizations which afford opportune assistance to those in need, and which draw the two orders more closely together. Among these may be enumerated: Societies for mutual help; various foundations established by private persons for providing for the workman, and for his widow or his orphans, in sudden calamity, in sickness, and in the event of death; and what are called "patronages," or institutions for the care of boys and girls, for young people, and also for those of more mature age.

The most important of all are Workmen's Associations; for these virtually include all the rest. History attests what excellent results were effected by the Artificer's Guilds of a former day. They were the means not only of many advantages to the workmen, but in no small degree of the advancement of art, as numerous monuments remain to prove. Such associations should be adapted to the requirements of the age in which we live—an age of greater instruction, of different customs, and of more numerous requirements in daily life. It is gratifying to know that there are actually in existence not a few Societies of this nature, consisting either of workmen alone or of workmen and employers together; but it were greatly to be desired that they should multiply and become more effective. We have spoken of them more than once; but it will be well to explain here how much they are needed, to show that they exist by their own right, and to enter into their organization, and their work.

The experience of his own weakness urges man to call in help from without. We read in the pages of Holy Writ: *It is better that two should be together than one; for they have the advantage of their society. If one fall he shall be supported by the other. Woe to him that is alone, for when he falleth he hath none to lift him up.** And further: *A brother*

* Ecclesiastes iv. 9, 10.

*that is helped by his brother is like a strong city.** It is this natural impulse which unites men in civil society; and it is this also which makes them band themselves together in associations of citizen with citizen; associations which, it is true, cannot be called societies in the complete sense of the word, but which are societies nevertheless.

These lesser societies, and the society which constitutes the State, differ in many things, because their immediate purpose and end is different. Civil society exists for the common good, and, therefore, is concerned with the interests of all in general, and with individual interests in their due place and proportion. Hence it is called *public* society, because by its means, as St. Thomas of St. Aquin says, *Men communicate with one another in the setting up of a commonwealth.*† But the societies which are formed in the bosom of the State are called *private*, and justly so, because their immediate purpose is the private advantage of the associates. *Now, a private society*, says St. Thomas again, *is one which is formed for the purpose of carrying out private business: as when two or three enter into a partnership with the view of trading in conjunction.*‡ Particular societies, then, although they exist within the State, and are each a part of the State, nevertheless cannot be prohibited by the State absolutely and as such. For to enter into "society" of this kind is the natural right of man: and the State must protect natural rights, not destroy them; and if it forbids its citizens to form associations, it contradicts the very principle of its own existence; for both they and it exist in virtue of the same principle, *viz.*: the natural propensity of man to live in society.

There are times, no doubt, when it is right that the law should interfere to prevent association; as when men join together for purposes which are evidently bad, unjust, or dangerous to the State. In such cases the public authority may justly forbid the formation of associations, and may dissolve them when they already exist. But every precaution should be taken not to violate the rights of individuals, and not to make unreasonable regulations under the pretence of

* Proverbs xviii. 19.

† *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem*, Cap. II. ‡ *Ibid.*

public benefit. For laws only bind when they are in accordance with right reason, and therefore with the eternal law of God.*

And here we are reminded of the Confraternities, Societies, and Religious Orders which have arisen by the Church's authority, and the piety of the Christian people. The annals of every nation down to our own times testify to what they have done for the human race. It is indisputable, on grounds of reason alone, that such associations, being perfectly blameless in their objects, have the sanction of the law of nature. On their religious side, they rightly claim to be responsible to the Church alone. The administrators of the State, therefore, have no rights over them, nor can they claim any share in their management; on the contrary, it is the State's duty to respect and cherish them, and, if necessary, to defend them from attack. It is notorious that a very different course has been followed, more especially in our own times. In many places the State has laid violent hands on these Communities, and committed manifold injustice against them; it has placed them under the civil law, taken away their rights as corporate bodies, and robbed them of their property. In such property the Church had her rights, each member of the body had his or her rights, and there were also the rights of those who had founded or endowed them for a definite purpose, and of those for whose benefit and assistance they existed. Wherefore We cannot refrain from complaining of such spoliation as unjust, and fraught with evil results; and with the more reason because, at the very time when the law proclaims that association is free to all, We see that Catholic societies, however peaceful and useful, are hindered in every way, whilst the utmost freedom is given to men whose objects are at once hurtful to Religion and dangerous to the State.

Associations of every kind, and especially those of working men, are now far more common than formerly. In re-

* *Human law is law only in virtue of its accordance with right reason: and thus it is manifest that it flows from the eternal law. And in so far as it deviates from right reason it is called an unjust law; in such case it is not law at all, but rather a species of violence.*—St. Thomas of Aquin, *Summa Theologica*, 1 a 2æ Q. xciii. Art. iii.

gard to many of these there is no need at present to inquire whence they spring, what are their objects, or what means they use. But there is a good deal of evidence which goes to prove that many of these societies are in the hands of invisable leaders, and are managed on principles far from compatible with Christianity and the public well-being; and that they do their best to get into their hands the whole field of labor, and to force workman either to join them or to starve. Under these circumstances Christian workman must do one of two things: either join associations in which their religion will be exposed to peril, or form associations among themselves—unite their forces and courageously shake off the yoke of an unjust and intolerable oppression. No one who does not wish to expose man's chief good to extreme danger will hesitate to say that the second alternative must by all means be adopted.

Those Catholics are worthy of all praise—and there are not a few—who, understanding what the times require, have, by various enterprises and experiments, endeavored to better the condition of the working people without any sacrifice of principle. They have taken up the cause of the working man, and have striven to make both families and individuals better off; to infuse the spirit of justice into the mutual relations of employer and employed; to keep before the eyes of both classes the precepts of duty and the laws of the Gospel—that Gospel which, by inculcating self-restraint, keeps men within the bounds of moderation, and tends to establish harmony among the divergent interests and various classes which compose the State. It is with such ends in view that We see men of eminence meeting together for discussion, for the promotion of united action, and for practical work. Others, again, strive to unite working people of various kinds into associations, help them with their advice and their means, and enable them to obtain honest and profitable work. The Bishops, on their part, bestow their ready goodwill and support; and with their approval and guidance many members of the clergy, both secular and regular, labor assiduously on behalf of the spiritual and mental interests of the members of Associations. And there are not wanting

Catholics possessed of affluence who have, as it were, cast in their lot with the wage-earners, and who have spent large sums in founding and widely spreading Benefit and Insurance Societies, by means of which the working man may without difficulty acquire by his labor not only many present advantages, but also the certainty of honorable support in time to come. How much this multiplied and earnest activity has benefited the community at large is too well known to require Us to dwell upon it. We find in it the grounds of the most cheering hope for the future: provided that the Associations We have described continue to grow and spread, and are well and wisely administered. Let the State watch over these Societies of citizens united together in the exercise of their right; but let it not thrust itself into their peculiar concerns and their organization; for things move and live by the soul within them, and they may be killed by the grasp of a hand without.

In order that an Association may be carried on with unity of purpose and harmony of action, its organization and government must be firm and wise. All such societies, being free to exist, have the further right to adopt such rules and organization as may best conduce to the attainment of their objects. We do not deem it possible to enter into definite details on the subject of organization: this must depend on national character, on practice and experience, on the nature and scope of the work to be done, on the magnitude of the various trades and employments, and on other circumstances of fact and of time—all of which must be carefully weighed.

Speaking summarily, we may lay it down as a general and perpetual law, that Workmen's Associations should be so organized and governed as to furnish the best and most suitable means for attaining what is aimed at, that is to say, for helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost in body, mind, and property. It is clear that they must pay special and principal attention to piety and morality, and that their internal discipline must be directed precisely by these considerations; otherwise they entirely lose their special character, and come to be very little better than those societies which take no account of religion at all.

What advantage can it be to a workman to obtain by means of a society all that he requires, and to endanger his soul for want of spiritual food? *What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul?** This, as Our Lord teaches, is the note or character that distinguishes the Christian from the heathen. *After all these things do the heathen seek. . . . Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you.*† Let our Associations, then, look first and before all to God; let religious instruction have therein a foremost place, each one being carefully taught what is his duty to God, what to believe, what to hope for, and how to work out his salvation; and let all be warned and fortified with especial solicitude against wrong opinions and false teaching. Let the working man be urged and led to the worship of God, to the earnest practice of religion, and, among other things, to the sanctification of Sundays and festivals. Let him learn to reverence and love Holy Church, the common Mother of us all; and so to obey the precepts, and to frequent the Sacraments of the Church, those Sacraments being the means ordained by God for obtaining forgiveness of sin and for leading a holy life.

The foundations of the organization being laid in Religion, We next go on to determine the relations of the members one to another, in order that they may live together in concord and go on prosperously and successfully. The offices and charges of the Society should be distributed for the good of the Society itself, and in such manner that difference in degree or position should not interfere with unanimity and good-will. Office-bearers should be appointed with prudence and discretion, and each one's charge should be carefully marked out; thus no member will suffer wrong. Let the common funds be administered with the strictest honesty, in such way that a member receive assistance in proportion to his necessities. The rights and duties of employers should be the subject of careful consideration as compared with the rights and duties of the employed. If it

* St. Matthew xvi. 26. † St. Matthew vi. 32, 33.

should happen that either a master or a workman deemed himself injured, nothing would be more desirable than that there should be a committee composed of honest and capable men of the Association itself, whose duty it should be, by the laws of the Association, to decide the dispute. Among the purposes of a Society should be to try to arrange for a continuous supply of work at all times and seasons; and to create a fund from which the members may be helped in their necessities, not only in cases of accident, but also in sickness, old age, and misfortune.

Such rules and regulations, if obeyed willingly by all, will sufficiently ensure the well-being of poor people; while such Mutual Associations among Catholics are certain to be productive, in no small degree, of prosperity to the State. It is not rash to conjecture the future from the past. Age gives way to age, but the events of one century are wonderfully like those of another; for they are directed by the providence of God, Who overrules the course of history in accordance with His purposes in creating the race of man. We are told that it was cast as a reproach on the Christians of the early ages of the Church, that the greater number of them had to live by begging or by labor. Yet, destitute as they were of wealth and influence, they ended by winning over to their side the favor of the rich and the good-will of the powerful. They showed themselves industrious, laborious, and peaceful, men of justice, and, above all, men of brotherly love. In the presence of such a life and such an example, prejudice disappeared, the tongue of malevolence was silenced, and the lying traditions of ancient superstition yielded little by little to Christian truth.

At this moment the condition of the working population is the question of the hour, and nothing can be of higher interest to all classes of the State than that it should be rightly and reasonably decided. But it will be easy for Christian working men to decide it aright if they form Associations, choose wise guides, and follow the same path which with so much advantage to themselves and the commonwealth was trod by their fathers before them. Prejudice, it is true, is mighty, and so is the love of money; but if the

sense of what is just and right be not destroyed by depravity of heart, their fellow-citizens are sure to be won over to a kindly feeling towards men whom they see to be so industrious and so modest, who so unmistakably prefer honesty to lucre, and the sacredness of duty to all other considerations.

And another great advantage would result from the state of things We are describing; there would be so much more hope and possibility of recalling to a sense of their duty those working men who have either given up their faith altogether, or whose lives are at variance with its precepts. These men, in most cases, feel that they have been fooled by empty promises and deceived by false appearances. They cannot but perceive that their grasping employers too often treat them with the greatest inhumanity, and hardly care for them beyond the profit their labor brings; and if they belong to an Association, it is probably one in which there exists, in place of charity and love, that intestine strife which always accompanies unresigned and irreligious poverty. Broken in spirit and worn down in body, how many of them would gladly free themselves from this galling slavery! But human respect, or the dread of starvation, makes them afraid to take the step. To such as these, Catholic Associations are of incalculable service, helping them out of their difficulties, inviting them to companionship, and receiving the repentant to a shelter in which they may securely trust.

We have now laid before you, Venerable Brethren, who are the persons, and what are the means, by which this most difficult question must be solved. Every one must put his hand to the work which falls to his share, and that at once and immediately, lest the evil which is already so great may by delay become absolutely beyond remedy. Those who rule the State must use the law and the institutions of the country; masters and rich men must remember their duty; the poor, whose interests are at stake, must make every lawful and proper effort; and since Religion alone, as we said at the beginning, can destroy the evil at its root, all men must be persuaded that the primary thing needful is to return to real Christianity, in the absence of which all the plans and devices of the wisest will be of little avail.

As far as regards the Church, its assistance will never be wanting, be the time or the occasion what it may; and it will intervene with the greater effect in proportion as its liberty of action is the more unfettered: let this be carefully noted by those whose office it is to provide for the public welfare. Every minister of holy Religion must throw into the conflict all the energy of his mind and all the strength of his endurance; with your authority, Venerable Brethren, and by your example, they must never cease to urge upon all men of every class, upon the high as well as the lowly, the Gospel doctrines of Christian life; by every means in their power they must strive for the good of the people; and above all they must earnestly cherish in themselves, and try to arouse in others, Charity, the mistress and queen of virtues. For the happy results we all long for must be chiefly brought about by the plenteous outpouring of Charity; of that true Christian Charity which is the fulfilling of the whole Gospel law, which is always ready to sacrifice itself for others' sake, and which is man's surest antidote against wordly pride and immoderate love of self; that Charity whose office is described and whose Godlike features are drawn by the Apostle St. Paul in these words: *Charity is patient, is kind, . . . seeketh not her own, . . . suffereth all things, . . . endureth all things.**

On each one of you, Venerable Brethren, and on your Clergy and people, as an earnest of God's mercy and a mark of our affection, We lovingly in the Lord bestow the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at St. Peter's in Rome, the fifteenth day of May, 1891, the fourteenth year of Our Pontificate.

LEO XIII., POPE.

* I. Corinthians xiii. 4–7.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR HOLY FATHER POPE LEO XIII.

ON

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY.

TO OUR VENERABLE BRETHREN, ALL PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS AND OTHER ORDINARIES IN PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE.

Venerable Brothers, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

THE grave discussions on economical questions which for some time past have disturbed the peace of several countries of the world are growing in frequency and intensity to such a degree, that the minds of thoughtful men are filled, and rightly so, with worry and alarm. These discussions take their rise in the bad philosophical and ethical teaching which is now widespread among the people. The changes also which the mechanical inventions of the age have introduced, the rapidity of communication between places and the devices of every kind for diminishing labor and increasing gain all add bitterness to the strife; and lastly matters have been brought to such a pass by the struggle between capital and labor, fomented as it is by professional agitators, that the countries where these disturbances most frequently occur, find themselves confronted with ruin and disaster.

At the very beginning of Our Pontificate We clearly pointed out what the peril was which confronted Society on

this head, and We deemed it Our duty to warn Catholics, in unmistakable language, how great the error was which was lurking in the utterances of Socialism, and how great the danger was that threatened not only their temporal possessions, but also their morality and religion. That was the purpose of Our Encyclical Letter *Quod Apostolici Muneris* which we published on the 18th of December in the year 1878; but as these dangers day by day threatened still greater disaster, both to individuals and the commonwealth, We strove with all the more energy to avert them. This was the object of Our Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of the 15th May, 1891, in which We dwelt at length on the rights and duties which both classes of Society—those, namely, who control capital, and those who contribute labor—are bound in relation to each other; and at the same time, We made it evident that the remedies which are most useful to protect the cause of Religion, and to terminate the contest between the different classes of Society, were to be found in the precepts of the Gospel.

Nor, with God's grace, were Our hopes entirely frustrated. Even those who are not Catholics, moved by the power of truth, avowed that the Church must be credited with a watchful care over all classes of Society, and especially those whom fortune had least favored. Catholics of course profited abundantly by these Letters, for they not only received encouragement and strength for the admirable enterprises in which they were engaged but also obtained the light which they desired, by the help of which they were able with greater safety and with more plentiful blessings to continue the efforts which they had been making in the matter of which We are now speaking. Hence it happened that the differences of opinion which prevailed among them were either removed or their acrimony diminished and the discussion laid aside. In the work which they had undertaken this was effected, viz.: that in their efforts for the elevation of the poorer classes, especially in those places where the trouble is greatest, many new enterprises were set on foot; those which were already established were increased and all reaped the blessing of a greater stability imparted to them. Some of

these works were called *Bureaus of the People*, their object being to supply information. Rural Savings Banks had been established, and various Associations, some for mutual aid, others, of relief, were organized. There were Working Men's Societies and other enterprises for work or beneficence. Thus under the auspices of the Church, united action of Catholics was secured as well as wise discrimination exercised in the distribution of help for the poor, who are often as badly dealt with by chicanery and exploitation of their necessities, as they are oppressed by indigence and toil. These schemes of popular benevolence were, at first, distinguished by no particular appellation. The name of *Christian Socialism* with its derivatives which was adopted by some was very properly allowed to fall into disuse. Afterwards some asked to have it called *The Popular Christian Movement*. In the countries most concerned with this matter, there are some who are known as *Christian Socialists*. Elsewhere the movement is described as *Christian Democracy*, and its partisans *Christian Democrats*, in contradistinction to those who are designated as *Socialists*, and whose system is known as *Social Democracy*. Not much exception is taken to the former, *i.e.*, *Christian Socialism*, but many excellent men find the term *Christian Democracy* objectionable. They hold it to be very ambiguous and for this reason open to two objections. It seems by implication to covertly favor popular government, and to disparage other methods of political administration. Secondly, it appears to belittle religion by restricting its scope to the care of the poor, as if the other sections of Society were not of its concern. More than that, under the shadow of its name, there might easily lurk a design to attack all legitimate power either civil or sacred. Wherefore, since this discussion is now so widespread, so exaggerated and so bitter, the consciousness of duty warns Us to put a check on this controversy and to define what Catholics are to think on this matter. We also propose to describe how the movement may extend its scope and be made more useful to the commonwealth.

What *Social Democracy* is and what *Christian Democracy* ought to be, assuredly no one can doubt. The first, with due

consideration to the greater or less intemperance of its utterance, is carried to such an excess by many as to maintain that there is really nothing existing above the natural order of things, and that the acquirement and enjoyment of corporal and external goods constitute man's happiness. It aims at putting all government in the hands of the people, reducing all ranks to the same level, abolishing all distinction of class, and finally introducing community of goods. Hence, the right of ownership is to be abrogated, and whatever property a man possesses, or whatever means of livelihood he has, is to be common to all.

As against this, *Christian Democracy*, by the fact that it is Christian, is built, and necessarily so, on the basic principles of Divine Faith, and provides for the betterment of the masses, with the ulterior object of availing itself of the occasion to fashion their minds for things which are everlasting. Hence, for *Christian Democracy* justice is sacred; it must maintain that the right of acquiring and possessing property cannot be impugned, and it must safeguard the various distinctions and degrees which are indispensable in every well-ordered commonwealth. Finally it must endeavor to preserve in every human society the form and the character which God ever impresses on it. It is clear, therefore, that there is nothing in common between *Social* and *Christian Democracy*. They differ from each other as much as the sect of Socialism differs from the profession of Christianity.

Moreover it would be a crime to distort this name of *Christian Democracy* to politics, for although democracy, both in its philological and philosophical significations, implies popular government, yet in its present application it is so to be employed that, removing from it all political significance, it is to mean nothing else than a benevolent and Christian movement in behalf of the people. For the laws of nature and of the Gospel, which by right are superior to all human contingencies, are necessarily independent of all modifications of civil government, while at the same time they are in concord with everything that is not repugnant to morality and justice, They are, therefore, and they must remain absolutely free from political parties, and have noth-

ing to do with the various changes of administration which may occur in a nation; so that Catholics may and ought to be citizens according to the constitution of any state, guided as they are by those laws which command them to love God above all things, and their neighbors as themselves. This has always been the discipline of the Church. The Roman Pontiffs acted upon this principle, whenever they dealt with different countries, no matter what might be the character of their governments. Hence, the mind and the action of Catholics who are devoted to the amelioration of the working classes, can never be actuated with the purpose of favoring and introducing one government in place of another.

In the same manner, from *Christian Democracy*, We must remove another possible subject of reproach, namely: that while looking after the advantage of the working people they should act in such a manner as to forget the upper classes of Society; for they also are of the greatest use in preserving and perfecting the commonwealth. As We have explained, the Christian law of charity will prevent Us from so doing. For it extends to all classes of Society, and all should be treated as members of the same family, as children of the same Heavenly Father, as redeemed by the same Saviour, and called to the same eternal heritage. Hence the doctrine of the Apostle who warns us that: "we are one body and one spirit called to the one hope in our vocation; one Lord, one Faith and one Baptism; one God and the Father of all who is above all, and through all, and in us all." Wherefore on account of the nature of the union which exists between the different classes of Society and which Christian brotherhood makes still closer, it follows that no matter how great Our devotion may be in helping the people, We should all the more keep Our hold upon the upper classes, because association with them is proper and necessary, as We shall explain later on, for the happy issue of the work in which We are engaged.

Let there be no question of fostering under this name of *Christian Democracy* any intention of diminishing the spirit of obedience, or of withdrawing people from their lawful rulers. Both the natural and the Christian law command

us to revere those who, in their various grades, are above us in the State, and to submit ourselves to their just commands. It is quite in keeping with our dignity as men and Christians to obey, not only exteriorly but from the heart, as the Apostle expresses it, *for conscience sake*, when he commands us to keep our soul subject to the higher powers. It is abhorrent to the profession of a Christian for any one to be unwilling to be subject and obedient to those who rule in the Church, and first of all to the bishops whom (without prejudice to the universal power of the Roman Pontiff) "the Holy Ghost has placed to rule the Church of God which Christ has purchased by His blood" (Acts xx. 28). He who thinks or acts otherwise is guilty of ignoring the grave precept of the Apostle who bids us to obey our rulers and to be subject to them, for they watch, having to give an account of our souls. Let the faithful everywhere implant these principles deep in their souls, and put them in practice in their daily life, and let the ministers of the Gospel meditate them profoundly, and incessantly labor not merely by exhortation but especially by example to make them enter into the souls of others.

We have recalled these matters which on other occasions We have made the subject of Our instructions, in the hope that all dissension about the name of *Christian Democracy* will cease and that all suspicion of any danger coming from what the name signifies will be put at rest. And with reason do We hope so; for neglecting the opinions of certain men, with regard to the power and the efficacy of this kind of *Christian Democracy*, which at times are exaggerated and are not free from error, let no one however condemn that zeal which, according to the natural and Divine law, has this for its object, viz.: to make the condition of those who toil more tolerable; to enable them to obtain, little by little, those means by which they may provide for the future; to help them to practice in public and in private the duties which morality and religion inculcate; to aid them to feel that they are not animals but men, not heathens but Christians, and so to enable them to strive more zealously and more eagerly for the one thing which is necessary, viz.: that

ultimate good for which we are all born into this world. This is the intention; this is the work of those who wish that the people should be animated by Christian sentiments and should be protected from the contamination of Socialism which threatens them.

We have designedly made mention here of virtue and religion. For, it is the opinion of some, and the error is already very common, that the social question is merely an economic one, whereas in point of fact, it is above all a moral and religious matter, and for that reason must be settled by the principles of morality and according to the dictates of religion. For even though wages are doubled and the hours of labor are shortened and food is cheapened, yet if the workingman hearkens to the doctrines that are taught on this subject, as he is prone to do, and is prompted by the examples set before him to throw off respect for God and to enter upon a life of immorality, his labors and his gain will avail him naught.

Trial and experience have made it abundantly clear that many a workman lives in cramped and miserable quarters, in spite of his shorter hours and larger wages, simply because he has cast aside the restraints of morality and religion. Take away the instinct which Christian virtue has planted and nurtured in men's hearts, take away prudence, temperance, frugality, patience and other correct natural habits, no matter how much he may strive, he will never achieve prosperity. That is the reason why We have incessantly exhorted Catholics to enter these associations for bettering the condition of the laboring classes, and to organize other undertakings with the same object in view; but We have likewise warned them that all this should be done under the auspices of religion, with its help and under its guidance.

The zeal of Catholics on behalf of the masses is especially noteworthy by the fact that it is engaged in the very field in which, under the benign inspiration of the Church, the active industry of charity has always labored, adapting itself in all cases to the varying exigencies of the times. For the law of mutual charity perfects, as it were, the law of justice,

not merely by giving each man his due and in not impeding him in the exercise of his rights, but also by befriending him in case of need, "not with the word alone, or the lips, but in deed and in truth"; being mindful of what Christ so lovingly said to His own: "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another as I have loved you, that you love also one another. By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, if you have love one for the other." This zeal in coming to the rescue of Our fellowmen should, of course, be solicitous, first for the imperishable good of the soul, but it must not neglect what is necessary and helpful for the body.

We should remember what Christ said to the disciples of the Baptist who asked Him: "Art Thou He that art to come or look we for another?" He invoked, as the proof of the mission given to Him among men, His exercise of charity, quoting for them the text of Isaias: "The blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, the poor have the gospel preached to them" (Matth. xi. 5). And speaking also of the last judgment and of the rewards and punishments He will assign, He declared that He would take special account of the charity men exercised towards each other. And in that discourse there is one thing that especially excites our surprise, viz.: that Christ omits those works of mercy which comfort the soul and refers only to external works which, although done in behalf of men, He regards as being done to Himself. "For I was hungry and you gave Me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave Me to drink; I was a stranger and you took Me in; naked and you covered Me; sick and you visited Me; I was in prison and you came to Me" (Matth. xxv. 35).

To the teachings which enjoin the twofold charity of spiritual and corporal works, Christ adds His own example so that no one may fail to recognize the importance which He attaches to it. In the present instance we recall the sweet words that came from His paternal heart: "I have pity on the multitude" (Mark vii. 2), as well as the desire He had to assist them even if it were necessary to invoke His

miraculous power. Of His tender compassion we have the proclamation made in Holy Writ, viz.: that "He went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil" (Acts x. 38). This law of charity which He imposed upon His apostles they in the most holy and zealous way put into practice; and after them those who embraced Christianity originated that wonderful variety of institutions for alleviating all the miseries by which mankind is afflicted. And these institutions carried on and continually increased their powers of relief and were the especial glories of Christianity and of the civilization of which it was the source, so that right-minded men never fail to admire those foundations, aware as they are of the proneness of men to concern themselves about their own and neglect the needs of others.

Nor are we to eliminate from the list of good works the giving of money for charity, in pursuance of what Christ has said: "But yet that which remaineth, give alms" (Luke xi. 41). Against this, the Socialist cries out and demands its abolition as injurious to the native dignity of man. But if it is done in the manner which the Scripture enjoins (Matth. vi. 2), and in conformity with the true Christian spirit, it neither connotes pride in the giver nor inflicts shame upon the one who receives. Far from being dishonorable for man it draws closer the bonds of human society by augmenting the force of the obligation of the duties which men are under with regard to each other. No one is so rich that he does not need another's help; no one so poor as not to be useful in some way to his fellowman; and the disposition to ask assistance from others with confidence, and to grant it with kindness, is part of our very nature. Thus justice and charity are so linked with each other, under the equable and sweet law of Christ, as to form an admirable cohesive power in human society and to lead all of its members to exercise a sort of providence in looking after their own and in seeking the common good as well.

As regards not merely the temporary aid given to the laboring classes, but the establishment of permanent institutions in their behalf, it is most commendable for charity to undertake them. It will thus see that more certain and

more reliable means of assistance will be afforded to the necessitous. That kind of help is especially worthy of recognition which forms the minds of mechanics and laborers to thrift and foresight so that in course of time they may be able, in part at least, to look out for themselves. To aim at that is not only to dignify the duty of the rich towards the poor, but to elevate the poor themselves; for while it urges them to work for a better degree of comfort in their manner of living, it preserves them meantime from danger by checking extravagance in their desires, and acts as a spur in the practice of the virtues proper to their state. Since, therefore, this is of such great avail and so much in keeping with the spirit of the times, it is a worthy object for charity to undertake with all prudence and zeal.

Let it be understood, therefore, that this devotion of Catholics to comfort and elevate the mass of the people is in keeping with the spirit of the Church and is most conformable to the examples which the Church has always held up for imitation. It matters very little whether it goes under the name of "*The Popular Christian Movement*," or "*Christian Democracy*," if the instructions that have been given by Us be fully carried out with the submission that is due. But it is of the greatest importance that Catholics should be one in mind, will and action in a matter of such great moment. And it is also of importance that the influence of these undertakings should be extended by the multiplication of men and means devoted to the same object.

Especially must there be appeals to the kindly assistance of those whose rank, worldly wealth and culture give them importance in the community. If their help is excluded, scarcely anything can be done which will be of any assistance for the wants which now clamor for satisfaction in this matter of the well-being of the people. Assuredly the more earnestly many of those who are prominent in the State conspire effectively to attain that object the quicker and surer will the end be reached. We wish them to understand that they are not at all free to look after or neglect those who happen to be beneath them, but that it is a strict duty which binds them. For no one lives only for his personal advan-

tage in a community; he lives for the common good as well, so that when others cannot contribute their share for the general object, those who can do so are obliged to make up the deficiency. The very extent of the benefits they have received increases the burden of their responsibility, and a stricter account will have to be rendered to God who bestowed those blessings upon them. What should also urge all to the fulfilment of their duty in this regard is the widespread disaster which will eventually fall upon all classes of Society, if this assistance does not arrive in time; and therefore is it that he who neglects the cause of the distressed poor is not doing his duty to himself or to the State.

If this social movement extends its scope far and wide in a true Christian fashion, and grows in its proper and genuine spirit, there will be no danger, as is feared, that those other institutions, which the piety of our ancestors his established and which are now flourishing, will decline or be absorbed by new foundations. Both of them spring from the same root of charity and religion, and not only do not conflict with each other, but can be made to coalesce and combine so perfectly as to provide by a union of their benevolent resources in a more efficacious manner against the graver perils and necessities of the people which confront us to-day.

The condition of things at present proclaims, and proclaims vehemently, that there is need for a union of brave minds with all the resources they can command. The harvest of misery is before Our eyes, and the dreadful projects of the most disastrous national upheavals are threatening Us from the growing power of the socialistic movement. They have insidiously worked their way into the very heart of the State, and in the darkness of their secret gatherings, and in the open light of day, in their writings and their harangues, they are urging the masses onward to sedition; they fling aside religious discipline, they scorn duties and clamor only for rights; they are working incessantly on the multitudes of the needy which daily grow greater, and which, because of their poverty, are easily deluded and hur-

ried off into ways that are evil. It is equally the concern of the State and of Religion, and all good men should deem it a sacred duty to preserve and guard both in the honor which is their due.

That this most desirable agreement of wills should be maintained, it is essential that all refrain from giving any causes of dissension in hurting and alienating the minds of others. Hence in newspapers and in speeches to the people, let them avoid subtle and useless questions which are neither easy to solve nor to understand except by minds of unusual ability and only after the most serious study. It is quite natural for people to think differently in doubtful questions, but those who address themselves to these subjects in a proper spirit will preserve their mental calm and not forget the respect which is due to those who differ from them. If minds see things in another light it is not necessary to become alienated forthwith. To whatever opinion a man's judgment may incline, if the matter is yet open to discussion let him keep it, provided his mental attitude is such that he is ready to yield if the Holy See should otherwise decide.

This Catholic action, of whatever description it may be, will work with greater effect if all of the various associations, while preserving their individual rights, move together under one primary and directive force.

In Italy We desire that this directive force should emanate from the Catholic Congresses and Reunions so often praised by Us, to further which Our Predecessor and We Ourselves have ordered that these meetings should be controlled and guided by the Bishops of the country. So let it be for other nations, in case there be any leading organization of this description to which this matter has been legitimately entrusted.

Now in all questions of this sort where the interests of the Church and the Christian people are so closely allied, it is evident what they who are in the sacred ministry should do, and it is clear how industrious they should be in inculcating right doctrine and in teaching the duties of prudence and charity. To go out and move among the people, to

exert a healthy influence on them by adapting themselves to the present condition of things, is what more than once in addressing the clergy We have advised. More frequently also in writing to the Bishops and other dignitaries of the Church, and especially of late (to the Minister General of the Minorites, November 25, 1898) We have lauded this affectionate solicitude for the people and declared it to be the especial duty of both the secular and regular clergy. But in the fulfilment of this obligation let there be the greatest caution and prudence exerted, and let it be done after the fashion of the saints. Francis, who was poor and humble, Vincent of Paul, the Father of the afflicted classes, and very many others whom the Church keeps ever in her memory, were wont to lavish their care upon the people, but in such wise as not to be engrossed overmuch or to be unmindful of themselves or to let it prevent them from laboring with the same assiduity in the perfection of their own soul and the cultivation of virtue.

There remains one thing upon which We desire to insist very strongly, in which not only the ministers of the Gospel, but also all those who are devoting themselves to the cause of the people, can with very little difficulty bring about a most commendable result. That is to inculcate in the minds of the people, in a brotherly way and whenever the opportunity presents itself, the following principles, viz.: to keep aloof on all occasions from seditious acts and seditious men; to guard inviolate the rights of others; to show a proper respect to superiors; to willingly perform the work in which they are employed; not to grow weary of the restraint of family life which in many ways is so advantageous; to keep to their religious practices above all, and in their hardships and trials to have recourse to the Church for consolation. In the furtherance of all this, it is very efficacious to propose the splendid example of the Holy Family of Nazareth, and to advise the invocation of its protection, and it also helps to remind the people of the examples of sanctity which have shone in the midst of poverty, and to hold up before them the reward that awaits them in the better life to come.

Finally We recur again to what We have already declared

and We insist upon it most solemnly, viz.: that whatever projects individuals or associations form in this matter should be done with due regard to Episcopal authority and absolutely under Episcopal guidance. Let them not be led astray by an excessive zeal in the cause of charity. If it leads them to be wanting in proper submission it is not a sincere zeal; it will not have any useful result and cannot be acceptable to God. God delights in the souls of those who put aside their own designs and obey the rulers of His Church as if they were obeying Him; He assists them even when they attempt difficult things and benignly leads them to their desired end. Let them show also examples of virtue, so as to prove that a Christian is a hater of idleness and indulgence, that he gives willingly from his goods for the help of others, and that he stands firm and unconquered in the midst of adversity. Examples of that kind have a power of moving people to dispositions of soul that make for salvation, and have all the greater force as the condition of those who give them is higher in the social scale.

We exhort you, Venerable Brethren, to provide for all this, as the necessities of men and of places may require, according to your prudence and your zeal, meeting as usual in council to combine with each other in your plans for the furtherance of these projects. Let your solicitude watch and let your authority be effective in controlling, compelling, and also in preventing, lest any one under the pretext of good should cause the rigor of sacred discipline to be relaxed or the order which Christ has established in His Church to be disturbed. Thus by the correct, concurrent, and ever-increasing labor of all Catholics, the truth will flash out more brilliantly than ever, viz.: that truth and true prosperity flourish especially among those people whom the Church controls and influences: and that she holds it as her sacred duty to admonish every one of what the law of God enjoins, to unite the rich and the poor in the bonds of fraternal charity, and to lift up and strengthen men's souls in the times when adversity presses heavily upon them.

Let Our commands and Our wishes be confirmed by the words which are so full of apostolic charity which the

Blessed Paul addressed to the Romans: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, be reformed in the newness of your mind; he that giveth, with simplicity; he that ruleth, with carefulness; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness. Let love be without dissimulation—hating that which is evil; clinging to that which is good; loving one another with the charity of brotherhood; with honor preventing one another; in carefulness, not slothful; rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; instant in prayer; communicating to the necessities of the saints; pursuing hospitality. Rejoice with them that rejoice; weep with them that weep; being of one mind to one another; to no man rendering evil for evil; providing good things not only in the sight of God but also in the sight of men."

As a pledge of these benefits receive the Apostolic Benediction which, Venerable Brethren, We grant most lovingly in the Lord to you and your clergy and people.

Given at Rome in St. Peter's, the 18th day of January 1901, in the 23d year of Our Pontificate.

LEO XIII., POPE.

STANDARD CATHOLIC BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY

BENZIGER BROTHERS,

CINCINNATI: 343 MAIN ST. | NEW YORK: 36 AND 38 BARCLAY ST. | CHICAGO: 211-213 MADISON ST.

DOCTRINE, INSTRUCTION, DEVOTION.

ABANDONMENT; or, Absolute Surrender of Self to Divine Providence. Rev. J. P. CAUSSADE, S.J. *net*, 0 40

ADORATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. TESNIERE. Cloth, *net*, 1 25

ALPHONSUS LIGUORI, ST. Complete Ascetic Works. 22 vols., each, *net*, 1 25

ANALYSIS OF THE GOSPELS. Rev. L. A. LAMBERT, LL.D. *net*, 1 25

APOSTLES' CREED, THE. Rev. MULLER, C.SS.R. *net*, 1 10

ART OF PROFITING BY OUR FAULTS. Rev. J. TISSOT. *net*, 0 40

BIBLE, THE HOLY. 0 80

BIRTHDAY SOUVENIR. Mrs. A. E. BUCHANAN. 0 50

BLESSED VIRGIN, THE. Rev. Dr. KELLER. 0 75

BLOSSOMS OF THE CROSS. EMILY GIEHRL. 1 25

BOOK OF THE PROFESSED.
Vol. I. *net*, 0 75
Vol. II. *net*, 0 60
Vol. III. *net*, 0 60

BOYS' AND GIRLS' MISSION BOOK. By the Redemptorist Fathers. 0 35
Per 100, 17 50

CATECHISM EXPLAINED, THE. SPIRAGO-CLARKE. *net*, 2 50

CATHOLIC BELIEF. FAA DI BRUNO.
Paper, *0.25; 100 copies, 15 00
Cloth, *0.50; 25 copies, 7 50

CATHOLIC CEREMONIES and Explanation of the Ecclesiastical Year. ABBE DURAND.
Paper, *0.30; 25 copies, 4 50
Cloth, *0.60; 25 copies, 9 00

CATHOLIC PRACTICE AT CHURCH AND AT HOME. Rev. ALEX. L. A. KLAUDER.
Paper, *0.30; 25 copies, 4 50
Cloth, *0.60; 25 copies, 9 00

CATHOLIC TEACHING FOR CHILDREN. WINIFRID WRAY. 0 40

CATHOLIC WORSHIP. Rev. R. BRENNAN, LL.D.
Paper, *0.15; 100 copies, 10 00
Cloth, *0.25; 100 copies, 17 00

CHARACTERISTICS OF TRUE DEVOTION. Rev. N. GROU, S.J. *net*, 0 75

CHARITY THE ORIGIN OF EVERY BLESSING. 0 60

CHILD OF MARY. Prayer-Book for Children. 0 60

CHILD'S PRAYER-BOOK OF THE SACRED HEART. 0 20

CHRISTIAN FATHER. Right Rev. W. CRAMER.
Paper, *0.25; 25 copies, 3 75
Cloth, *0.40; 25 copies, 6 00

CHRISTIAN MOTHER. Right Rev. W. CRAMER.
Paper, *0.25; 25 copies, 3 7
Cloth, *0.40; 25 copies, 6 0

CHURCH AND HER ENEMIES. Rev. M. MULLER, C.SS.R. || *net*, 1 1

COMEDY OF ENGLISH PROTESTANTISM. A. F. MARSHALL. *net*, 0 7

COMPLETE OFFICE OF HOLY WEEK. 0 5
100 copies, 25 0

COMMUNION. Per 100, *net*, 3 5
CONFESSION. } Edited by Rev. JOHN J. NASH, D.D. Per 100, *net*, 3 5
CONFIRMATION. Per 100, *net*, 3 5

COUNSELS OF ST. ANGELA to Her Sisters in Religion. *net*, 0 2

DEVOTION OF THE HOLY ROSARY and the Five Scapulars. || *net*, 0 7

DEVOTIONS AND PRAYERS FOR THE SICK-ROOM. KREBS, C.SS.R.
Cloth, *net*, 1 0

DEVOTIONS AND PRAYERS OF ST. ALPHONSUS. A Complet
Prayer-book. ‡1 0

DEVOTIONS TO THE SACRED HEART for the First Friday of Ever
Month. By PERE HUGUET. 0 4

DEVOUT INSTRUCTIONS, GOFFINE'S. 1.00; 25 copies, 17 5

DIGNITY AND DUTY OF THE PRIEST; or, Selva, a Collection of Mate
rial for Ecclesiastical Retreats. By St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. *net*, 1 2

DIGNITY, AUTHORITY, DUTIES OF PARENTS, ECCLESIASTICAL
AND CIVIL POWERS. By Rev. M. MULLER, C.SS.R. || *net*, 1 4

DIVINE OFFICE: Explanations of the Psalms and Canticles. By St. AL
PHONSUS DE LIGUORI. *net*, 1 2

EPISTLES AND GOSPELS. 0.25; 100 copies, 19 0

EUCHARIST AND PENANCE. Rev. M. MULLER, C.SS.R. || *net*, 1 1

EUCHARISTIC CHRIST, Reflections and Considerations on the Blesse
Sacrament. Rev. A. TESNIERE. *net*, 1 0

EUCHARISTIC GEMS. A Thought About the Most Blessed Sacrament fo
Every Day in the Year. By Rev. L. C. COELENBIER. 0 7

EXPLANATION OF COMMANDMENTS, ILLUSTRATED. 1 0

EXPLANATION OF THE APOSTLES' CREED, ILLUSTRATED. 1 0

EXPLANATION OF THE BALTIMORE CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN
DOCTRINE. Rev. TH. L. KINKEAD. *net*, 1 0

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMANDMENTS, Precepts of the Churc
Rev. M. MULLER, C.SS.R. || *net*, 1 1

EXPLANATION OF THE GOSPELS and of Catholic Worship. Rev. L. A
LAMBERT.
Paper, *0.30; 25 copies, 4 5
Cloth, *0.60; 25 copies, 9 0

EXPLANATION OF THE HOLY SACRAMENTS, ILLUSTRATED. 1 0

EXPLANATION OF THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. Rev. M
V. COCHEM. 1 2

EXPLANATION OF THE OUR FATHER AND THE HAIL MARY
Rev. R. BRENNAN, LL.D. 0 7

EXPLANATION OF THE PRAYERS AND CEREMONIES OF TH
MASS, ILLUSTRATED. Rev. D. I. LANSLOTS, O.S.B. 1 2

EXPLANATION OF THE SALVE REGINA. LIGUORI. 0 7

EXTREME UNCTION. 0 1
100 copies, 6 0

FAMILIAR EXPLANATION OF CATHOLIC DOCTRINE. Rev. M
MULLER, C.SS.R. 1 0

FIRST AND GREATEST COMMANDMENT. By Rev. M. MULLE
C.SS.R. || *net*, 1 4

FIRST COMMUNICANT'S MANUAL. ‡0 5
100 copies, 25 0

FLOWERS OF THE PASSION. Thoughts of St. Paul of the Cross. B
Rev. LOUIS TH. DE JESUS-AGONISANT. *0.50; per 100 copies, 30 0

FOLLOWING OF CHRIST. Thomas a Kempis.
With Reflections, †0.50; 100 copies, 25 00
Without Reflections, ‡0.45; 100 copies, 22 50
Edition de luxe, †1 50

FOUR LAST THINGS, THE: Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell. Meditations. Father M. v. Cochem. Cloth, 0 75

GARLAND OF PRAYER. With Nuptial Mass. Leather, †0 90

GENERAL CONFESSION MADE EASY. Rev. A. Konings, C.SS.R. Flexible. ||0.15; 100 copies, 10 00

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. Verheyen, O.S.B. *net*, 0 30

GLORIES OF DIVINE GRACE. Dr. M. J. Scheeben. *net*, 1 50

GLORIES OF MARY. St. Alphonsus de Liguori. 2 vols., *net*, 2 50

GOFFINE'S DEVOUT INSTRUCTIONS. 140 Illustrations. Cloth, 1.00; 25 copies, 17 50

GOLDEN SANDS. Little Counsels for the Sanctification and Happiness of Daily Life.
Third Series, 0 50
Fourth Series, 0 50
Fifth Series, 0 50

GRACE AND THE SACRAMENTS. By Rev. M. Muller, C.SS.R. || *net*, 1 25

GREAT MEANS OF SALVATION AND OF PERFECTION. St. Alphonsus de Liguori. *net*, 1 25

GREAT SUPPER OF GOD, THE. A Treatise on Weekly Communion. By Rev. S. Coube, S.J. Edited by Rev. F. X. Brady, S.J. Cloth, *net*, 1 00

GREETINGS TO THE CHRIST-CHILD, a Collection of Poems for the Young. Illustrated. 0 60

GUIDE TO CONFESSION AND COMMUNION. †0 60

HANDBOOK OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. By S. J. W. Wilmers. *net*, 1 50

HAPPY YEAR, A. Abbe Lasausse. *net*, 1 00

HEART OF ST. JANE FRANCES DE CHANTAL. Thoughts and Prayers. Compiled by the Sisters of the Divine Compassion. *net*, 0 40

HELP FOR THE POOR SOULS IN PURGATORY. †0 50

HIDDEN TREASURE: The Value and Excellence of the Holy Mass. By St. Leonard of Pt. Maurice. 0 50

HISTORY OF THE MASS. By Rev. J. O'Brien. *net*, 1 25

HOLY EUCHARIST. By St. Alphonsus de Liguori. The Sacrifice, the Sacrament and the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ. Novena to the Holy Ghost. *net*, 1 25

HOLY MASS. By Rev. M. Muller, C.SS.R. || *net*, 1 25

HOLY MASS. By St. Alphonsus de Liguori. *net*, 1 25

HOW TO COMFORT THE SICK. Rev. Jos. A. Krebs, C.SS.R. Cloth, *net*, 1 00

HOW TO MAKE THE MISSION. By a Dominican Father. Paper, 0 10; per 100, 5 00

ILLUSTRATED PRAYER-BOOK FOR CHILDREN. †0.25; 100 copies, 17 00

IMITATION OF CHRIST. See "Following of Christ."

IMITATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. Translated by Mrs. A. R. Bennett-Gladstone.
Plain Edition, †0 50
Edition de luxe, †1 50

IMITATION OF THE SACRED HEART. By Rev. F. Arnoudt, S.J. †1 25

INCARNATION, BIRTH, AND INFANCY OF JESUS CHRIST; or, the Mysteries of Faith. By St. Alphonsus de Liguori. *net*, 1 25

INDULGENCES, A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO. Rev. P. M. Bernad, O.M.I. 0 75

IN HEAVEN WE KNOW OUR OWN. By Pere S. J. Blot. 0 60

INSTRUCTIONS AND PRAYERS FOR THE CATHOLIC FATHER. Right Rev. Dr. A. Egger. †0 75

INSTRUCTIONS AND PRAYERS FOR THE CATHOLIC MOTHER. Right Rev. Dr. A. Egger. †0 75

INSTRUCTIONS, Fifty-two, on the Principal Truths of Our Holy Religion. By Rev. Thos. F. Ward. *net*, 0 75

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FIRST COMMUNICANTS. By Rev. Dr. J. Schmitt. *net*, 0 50

INSTRUCTIONS ON THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD and the Sacraments of the Church. By St. Alphonsus de Liguori.
Paper, 0.25; 25 copies, 3 75
Cloth, 0.40; 25 copies, 6 00

INTERIOR OF JESUS AND MARY. Grou. 2 vols., *net*, 2 00

INTRODUCTION TO A DEVOUT LIFE. By St. Francis de Sales. Cloth, †0.50; 100 copies, 30 00

JESUS THE GOOD SHEPHERD. Right Rev. L. de Goesbriand, D.D., Bishop of Burlington. *net*, 0 75

LABORS OF THE APOSTLES, Their Teaching of the Nations. By Right Rev. L. de Goesbriand, D.D., Bishop of Burlington. *net*, 1 00

LETTERS OF ST. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. 4 vols., each vol., *net*, 1 25

LETTERS OF ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI and General Alphabetical Index to St. Alphonsus' Works. *net*, 1 25

LITTLE BOOK OF SUPERIORS. *net*, 0 60

LITTLE CHILD OF MARY. A Small Prayer-book. †0.35; 100 copies, 21 00

LITTLE MANUAL OF ST. ANTHONY. Illustrated. †0.60; 100 copies, 36 00

LITTLE MONTH OF MAY. By Ella McMahon. Flexible, 0 25
100 copies, 19 00

LITTLE MONTH OF THE SOULS IN PURGATORY. 0.25; 100 copies, 19 00

LITTLE OFFICE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. 0.05; per 100, 2 50

LITTLE PRAYER-BOOK OF THE SACRED HEART. By Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque. †0 40

MANIFESTATION OF CONSCIENCE. Langogne, O.M.Cap. *net*, 0 50

MANUAL OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. Complete Manual of Devotion of the Mother of God. †0 60

MANUAL OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST. Conferences on the Blessed Sacrament and Eucharistic Devotions. By Rev. F. X. Lasance. †0 75

MANUAL OF THE HOLY FAMILY. †0 60

MARIÆ COROLLA. Poems by Father Edmund of the Heart of Mary, C.P. Cloth, 1 25

MASS, THE, OUR GREATEST TREASURE. By Rev. F. X. Lasance. Cloth, †0 75

MAXIMS AND COUNSELS OF FRANCIS DE SALES. *net*, 0 35

MAY DEVOTIONS, NEW. Rev. Augustine Worth, O.S.B. *net*, 1 00

MEANS OF GRACE. By Rev. Richard Brennan, LL.D. *2 50

MEDITATIONS FOR ALL THE DAYS OF THE YEAR. By Rev. M. Hamon, S.S. 5 vols., *net*, 5 00

MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR. Baxter. *net*, 1 25

MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR. Rev. B. Vercruysse, S.J. 2 vols., *net*, 2 75

MEDITATIONS FOR RETREATS. St. Francis de Sales. Cloth, *net*, 0 75

MEDITATIONS FOR SECULAR PRIESTS. Chaignon, S.J. 2 vols., *net*, 4 00

MEDITATIONS ON THE FOUR LAST THINGS. Father M. v. Cochem. 0 75

MEDITATIONS ON THE LAST WORDS FROM THE CROSS. Father Charles Perraud. *net*, 0 50

MEDITATIONS ON THE LIFE, THE TEACHINGS, AND THE PASSION OF JESUS CHRIST. ILG-CLARKE. 2 vols., *net*, 3 50

MEDITATIONS ON THE MONTH OF OUR LADY. 0 75

MEDITATIONS ON THE PASSION OF OUR LORD. *0.40; 100 copies, 24 00

MEDITATIONS ON THE SUFFERINGS OF JESUS CHRIST. By Rev. FRANCIS DA PERINALDO. *net*, 0 75

MISCELLANY. Historical sketch of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. Rules and Constitutions of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. Instructions on the Religious State. By St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. *net*, 1 25

MISSION BOOK FOR THE MARRIED. Very Rev. F. GIRARDEY, C.SS.R. 0.50; 100 copies, 25 00

MISSION BOOK FOR THE SINGLE. Very Rev. F. GIRARDEY, C.SS.R. 0.50; 100 copies, 25 00

MISSION BOOK OF THE REDEMPTORIST FATHERS. A Manual of Instructions and Prayers to Preserve the Fruits of the Mission. Drawn chiefly from the works of St. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. 0.50; 100 copies, 25 00

MISTRESS OF NOVICES, THE, Instructed in Her Duties. LEGUAY. *net*, 0 75

MOMENTS BEFORE THE TABERNACLE. Rev. MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J. *net*, 0 40

MONTH, NEW, OF ST. JOSEPH. St. FRANCIS DE SALES. 0 25

MONTH, NEW, OF THE HOLY ANGELS. St. FRANCIS DE SALES. 0.25; 100 copies, 19 00

MONTH, NEW, OF THE SACRED HEART. St. FRANCIS DE SALES. 0 25

MONTH OF MARY, NEW. St. FRANCIS DE SALES. 0 25

MONTH OF MAY; a Series of Meditations on the Mysteries of the Life of the Blessed Virgin. By F. DEBUSSI, S.J. 0 50

MONTH OF THE DEAD; or, Prompt and Easy Deliverance of the Souls in Purgatory. By ABBE CLOQUET. 0 50

MOST HOLY ROSARY. Thirty-one Meditations. Right Rev. W. CRAMER, D.D. 0 50

MOST HOLY SACRAMENT. Rev. Dr. Jos. KELLER. 0 75

MY FIRST COMMUNION: The Happiest Day of My Life. BRENNAN. 0 75

NEW RULE OF THE THIRD ORDER. 0.05; per 100, 3 00

NEW TESTAMENT. Cheap Edition.
32mo, flexible cloth, *net*, 0 15
32mo, lambskin, limp, round corners, gilt edges, *net*, 0 75

NEW TESTAMENT. Illustrated Edition.
24mo, garnet cloth, with 100 full-page illustrations, *net*, 0 60
24mo, Rutland Roan, limp, round corners, red or gold edges, *net*, 1 25

NEW TESTAMENT. India Paper Edition.
3003 Lambskin, limp, round corners, gilt edges, *net*, 1 00
4011 Persian Calf, limp, round corners, gilt edges, *net*, 1 25
4017 Morocco, limp, round corners, gold edges, gold roll inside, *net*, 1 50

NEW TESTAMENT. Large Print Edition.
12mo, cloth, round corners, red edges, *net*, 0 75
12mo, American Seal, limp, round corners, red or gold edges, *net*, 1 50

NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES. By Right Rev. Mgr. THOMAS J. CONATY, D.D. 12mo, 0 60

OFFICE, COMPLETE, OF HOLY WEEK. ‡0.50; 100 copies, 25 00

ON THE ROAD TO ROME. By W. RICHARDS. *net*, 0 50

OUR BIRTHDAY BOUQUET. E. C. DONNELLY. 1 00

OUR LADY OF GOOD COUNSEL IN GENAZZANO. Mgr. GEO. F. DILLON, D.D. 0 75

OUR FAVORITE DEVOTIONS. By Very Rev. Dean A. A. LINGS. †0 60

OUR FAVORITE NOVENAS. Very Rev. Dean A. A. LINGS. †0 60

OUR MONTHLY DEVOTIONS. By Very Rev. Dean A. A. LINGS. †1 25

OUR OWN WILL AND HOW TO DETECT IT IN OUR ACTIONS. Rev. JOHN ALLEN, D.D. *net*, 0 75

PARACLETE, THE. Devotions to the Holy Ghost. ||0 60

PARADISE ON EARTH OPENED TO ALL; A Religious Vocation the Surest Way in Life. By Rev. ANTONIO NATALE, S.J. *net*, 0 40

PASSION AND DEATH OF JESUS CHRIST. By St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. *net*, 1 25

PASSION FLOWERS. Poems by Father EDMUND, of the Heart of Mary, C.P. 1 25

PEARLS FROM THE CASKET OF THE SACRED HEART. ELEANOR C. DONNELLY. 0 50

PEOPLE'S MISSION BOOK, THE. Paper, 0.10; per 100, 6 00

PERFECT RELIGIOUS, THE. DE LA MOTTE. Cloth, *net*, 1 00

PICTORIAL LIVES OF THE SAINTS. New, very cheap edition, with Reflections for Every Day in the Year. 1.00; 25 copies, 17 50

PIOUS PREPARATION FOR FIRST HOLY COMMUNION. Rev. F. X. LASANCE. Cloth, †0 75

POPULAR INSTRUCTIONS ON MARRIAGE. Very Rev. F. GIRARDEY, C.SS.R. Paper, 0.25; 25 copies, 3 75
Cloth, 0.40; 25 copies, 6 00

POPULAR INSTRUCTIONS ON PRAYER. By Very Rev. FERREOL GIRARDEY, C.SS.R. Paper, 0.25; 25 copies, 3 75
Cloth, 0.40; 25 copies, 6 00

POPULAR INSTRUCTIONS TO PARENTS on the Bringing Up of Children. By Very Rev. F. GIRARDEY, C.SS.R. Paper, 0.25; 25 copies, 3 75
Cloth, 0.40; 25 copies, 6 00

PRAYER-BOOK FOR LENT. Gethsemani, Jerusalem, and Golgotha. Rev. A. GEYER. †0 50

PRAYER. The Great Means of Obtaining Salvation. By St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. 0 50

PREACHING. Vol. XV. St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. The Exercises of the Missions. Various Counsels. Instructions on the Commandments and Sacraments. *net*, 1 25

PREPARATION FOR DEATH. St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. Considerations on the Eternal Truths. Maxims of Eternity. Rule of Life. *net*, 1 25

PRODIGAL SON; or, the Sinner's Return to God. || *net*, 1 00

REASONABLENESS OF CATHOLIC CEREMONIES AND PRACTICES. Rev. J. J. BURKE. *0 35

RELIGIOUS STATE, THE. With a Treatise on the Vocation to the Priesthood. By St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. 0 50

REVELATIONS OF THE SACRED HEART to Blessed Margaret Mary. BOUGAUD. Cloth, *net*, 1 50

SACRAMENTALS OF THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH. Rev. A. A. LAMBING, D.D. Paper, 0.30; 25 copies, 4 50
Cloth, 0.60; 25 copies, 9 00

SACRAMENTALS—Prayer, etc. By Rev. M. MULLER, C.SS.R. || *net*, 1 00

SACRED HEART, THE. Rev. Dr. JOSEPH KELLER. 0 75

SACRED HEART, THE, Studied in the Sacred Scriptures. Rev. H. SAINTRAIN, C.SS.R. *net*, 2 00

SACRIFICE OF THE MASS WORTHILY CELEBRATED, THE. By Rev. Father CHAIGNON, S.J. *net*, 1 50

SECRET OF SANCTITY. St. FRANCIS DE SALES. *net*, 1 00

SERAPHIC GUIDE, THE. A Manual for the Members of the Third Order of St. Francis. By a Franciscan Father. †0 60

SHORT CONFERENCES ON THE LITTLE OFFICE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. Very Rev. J. RAINER. 0 50

SHORT STORIES ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. From the French by MARY MCMAHON. *net*, 0 75

SPIRITUAL CRUMBS FOR HUNGRY LITTLE SOULS. MARY E. RICHARDSON. 0 50

SPIRITUAL DIRECTION. *net*, 0 60

SPIRITUAL EXERCISES FOR TEN DAYS' RETREAT. Very Rev. V. Smetana, C.SS.R. *net*, 1 00

SODALISTS' VADE MECUM. ‡0 50

SONGS AND SONNETS. By Maurice Francis Egan. 1 00

SOUVENIR OF THE NOVITIATE. By Rev. Edward I. Taylor. *net*, 0 60

ST. ANTHONY. Rev. Dr. Jos. Keller. 0 75

ST. JOSEPH, OUR ADVOCATE. By Father Huguet. 0 90

STATIONS OF THE CROSS. Illustrated. †0 50

STORIES FOR FIRST COMMUNICANTS. Rev. J. A. Keller, D.D. 0 50

STRIVING AFTER PERFECTION. Rev. Joseph Bayma, S.J. *net*, 1 00

SURE WAY TO A HAPPY MARRIAGE. Rev. Edward I. Taylor.
Paper, 0.25; 25 copies, 3 75
Cloth, 0.40; 25 copies, 6 00

THIRTY-TWO INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE MONTH OF MAY. Rev. Thomas F. Ward. *net*, 0 75

THOUGHT FROM BENEDICTINE SAINTS. *net*, 0 35

THOUGHT FROM ST. ALPHONSUS. *net*, 0 35

THOUGHT FROM ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI and His Saints. *net*, 0 35

THOUGHT FROM ST. IGNATIUS. *net*, 0 35

THOUGHT FROM ST. THERESA. *net*, 0 35

THOUGHT FROM ST. VINCENT DE PAUL. *net*, 0 35

THOUGHTS AND COUNSELS for the Consideration of Catholic Young Men. Rev. P. A. Doss, S.J. || *net*, 1 25

TRUE POLITENESS. Abbe Francis Demore. *net*, 0 60

TRUE SPOUSE OF JESUS CHRIST. By St. Alphonsus de Liguori. 2 vols., Centenary Edition, *net*, 2 50
The same in 1 volume, *net*, 1 00

TWO SPIRITUAL RETREATS FOR SISTERS. By Rev. E. Zollner. *net*, 1 00

VENERATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. Her Feasts, Prayers, Religious Orders, and Sodalities. By Rev. B. Rohner, O.S.B. 1 25

VICTORIES OF THE MARTYRS; or, the Lives of the Most Celebrated Martyrs of the Church. Vol. IX. By Alphonsus de Liguori. *net*, 1 25

VISITS TO JESUS IN THE TABERNACLE. Hours and Half Hours of Adoration before the Blessed Sacrament. With a Novena to the Holy Ghost and Devotions for Mass, Holy Communion, etc. Rev. F. X. Lasance. Cloth, †1 25

VISITS TO THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT and to the Blessed Virgin Mary. By St. Alphonsus de Liguori. †0 50

VOCATIONS EXPLAINED: Matrimony, Virginity, The Religious State, and the Priesthood. By a Vincentian Father. 0.10; 100 copies, 6 00

WAY OF INTERIOR PEACE. By Rev. Father De Lehen, S.J. *net*, 1 25

WAY OF SALVATION AND PERFECTION. Meditations, Pious Reflections, Spiritual Treatises. St. Alphonsus de Liguori. *net*, 1 25

WAY OF THE CROSS. Paper, 0.05; 100 copies, 2 50

WORDS OF JESUS CHRIST DURING HIS PASSION. Explained in Their Literal and Moral Sense. By Rev. F. X. Schouppe, S.J. *0.25; 100 copies, 17 00

WORDS OF WISDOM. A Concordance to the Sapiential Books. Edited by Rev. John J. Bell. *net*, 1 25

YEAR OF THE SACRED HEART. A Thought for Every Day of the Year. Anna T. Sadlier. 0 50

YOUNG GIRLS' BOOK OF PIETY, AT SCHOOL AND AT HOME. A Prayer-book for Girls in Convent Schools and Academies. Golden Sands. †1 00

ZEAL IN THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY: The Means by which Every Priest May Render His Ministry Honorable and Fruitful. By Abbe Dubois. *net*, 1 50

ADVENTURES OF A CASKET. 0 45
ADVENTURES OF A FRENCH CAPTAIN. 0 45
AN ADVENTURE WITH THE APACHES. By Gabriel Ferry. 0 40
ANTHONY. A Tale of the Time of Charles II. of England. 0 45
ARMORER OF SOLINGEN. By William Herchenbach. 0 40
BERTHA; or, Consequences of a Fall. 0 45
BEST FOOT FORWARD. By Father Finn. 0 85
BETTER PART. 0 45
BISTOURI. By A. Melandri. 0 40
BLACK LADY, AND ROBIN RED BREAST. By Canon Schmid. 0 25
BLANCHE DE MASSILLY. 0 45
BLISSYLVANIA POST-OFFICE. By Marion Ames Taggart. 0 40
BOYS IN THE BLOCK. By Maurice F. Egan. 0 25
BRIC-A-BRAC DEALER. 0 45
BUZZER'S CHRISTMAS. By Mary T. Waggaman. 0 25
BY BRANSCOME RIVER. By Marion Ames Taggart. 0 40
CAKE AND THE EASTER EGGS. By Canon Schmid. 0 25
CANARY BIRD. By Canon Schmid. 0 45
CAPTAIN ROUGEMONT. 0 45
CASSILDA; or the Moorish Princess. 0 45
CAVE BY THE BEECH FORK, THE. By Rev. H. S. Spalding, S.J. Cloth, 0 85
CLAUDE LIGHTFOOT; or, How the Problem Was Solved. By Father Finn. 0 85
COLLEGE BOY, A. By Anthony Yorke. Cloth, 0 85
CONVERSATION ON HOME EDUCATION. 0 45
DIMPLING'S SUCCESS. By Clara Mulholland. 0 40
EPISODES OF THE PARIS COMMUNE. An Account of the Religious Persecution. 0 45
ETHELRED PRESTON; or the Adventures of a Newcomer. By Father Finn. 0 85
EVERY-DAY GIRL, AN. By Mary C. Crowley. 0 40
FATAL DIAMONDS. By E. C. Donnelly. 0 25
FINN, REV. F. J., S.J.:
HIS FIRST AND LAST APPEARANCE. Illustrated. 1 00
THE BEST FOOT FORWARD. 0 85
THAT FOOTBALL GAME. 0 85
ETHELRED PRESTON. 0 85
CLAUDE LIGHTFOOT. 0 85
HARRY DEE. 0 85
TOM PLAYFAIR. 0 85
PERCY WYNN. 0 85
MOSTLY BOYS. 0 85
FISHERMAN'S DAUGHTER. 0 45
FIVE O'CLOCK STORIES; or, The Old Tales Told Again. 0 75
FLOWER OF THE FLOCK, THE, and the Badgers of Belmont. By Maurice F. Egan. 0 85
FRED'S LITTLE DAUGHTER. By Sara Trainer Smith. 0 40
GERTRUDE'S EXPERIENCE. 0 45
GODFREY THE HERMIT. By Canon Schmid. 0 25
GREAT-GRANDMOTHER'S SECRET. 0 45
HARRY DEE; or, Working it Out. By Father Finn. 0 85
HEIR OF DREAMS, AN. By Sallie Margaret O'Malley. 0 40
HER FATHER'S RIGHT HAND. 0 45

HIS FIRST AND LAST APPEARANCE. By Father FINN. 1 00
HOP BLOSSOMS. By CANON SCHMID. 0 25
HOSTAGE OF WAR, A. By MARY G. BONESTEEL. 0 40
HOW THEY WORKED THEIR WAY. By MAURICE F. EGAN. 0 75
INUNDATION, THE. CANON SCHMID. 0 40
JACK HILDRETH ON THE NILE. By MARION AMES TAGGART. Cloth, 0 85
JACK O' LANTERN. By MARY T. WAGGAMAN. 0 40
KLONDIKE PICNIC. By ELEANOR C. DONNELLY. 0 85
LAMP OF THE SANCTUARY. By Cardinal WISEMAN. 0 25
LEGENDS OF THE HOLY CHILD JESUS from Many Lands. By A. FOWLER LUTZ. 0 75
LITTLE MISSY. By MARY T. WAGGAMAN. 0 40
LOYAL BLUE AND ROYAL SCARLET. By MARION A. TAGGART. 0 85
MADCAP SET AT ST. ANNE'S. By MARION J. BRUNOWE. 0 40
MARCELLE. A True Story. 0 45
MASTER FRIDOLIN. By EMMY GIEHRL. 0 25
MILLY AVELING. By SARA TRAINER SMITH. Cloth, 0 85
MOSTLY BOYS. By Father FINN. 0 85
MYSTERIOUS DOORWAY. By ANNA T. SADLIER. 0 40
MY STRANGE FRIEND. By Father FINN. 0 25
NAN NOBODY. By MARY T. WAGGAMAN. 0 40
OLD CHARLMONT'S SEED-BED. By SARA TRAINER SMITH. 0 40
OLD ROBBER'S CASTLE. By CANON SCHMID. 0 25
OLIVE AND THE LITTLE CAKES. 0 45
OVERSEER OF MAHLBOURG. By CANON SCHMID. 0 25
PANCHO AND PANCHITA. By MARY E. MANNIX. 0 40
PAULINE ARCHER. By ANNA T. SADLIER. 0 40
PERCY WYNN; or, Making a Boy of Him. By Father FINN. 0 85
PICKLE AND PEPPER. By ELLA LORAINE DORSEY. 0 85
PRIEST OF AUVRIGNY. 0 45
QUEEN'S PAGE. By KATHARINE TYNAN HINKSON. 0 40
RICHARD; or, Devotion to the Stuarts. 0 45
ROSE BUSH. By CANON SCHMID. 0 25
SEA-GULL'S ROCK. By J. SANDEAU. 0 40
SUMMER AT WOODVILLE. By ANNA T. SADLIER. 0 40
TALES AND LEGENDS OF THE MIDDLE AGES. F. DE CAPELLA. 0 75
TAMING OF POLLY. By ELLA LORAINE DORSEY. 0 85
THAT FOOTBALL GAME: and What Came of It. By Father FINN. 0 85
THREE GIRLS AND ESPECIALLY ONE. By MARION A. TAGGART. 0 40
THREE LITTLE KINGS. By EMMY GIEHRL. 0 25
TOM PLAYFAIR; or, Making a Start. By Father FINN. 0 85
TOM'S LUCKPOT. By MARY T. WAGGAMAN. 0 40
TREASURE OF NUGGET MOUNTAIN. By M. A. TAGGART. 0 85
VILLAGE STEEPLE, THE. 0 45
WINNETOU, THE APACHE KNIGHT. By MARION AMES TAGGART. 0 85
WRONGFULLY ACCUSED. By WILLIAM HERCHENBACH. 0 40

NOVELS AND STORIES.

ASER, THE SHEPHERD. A Christmas Story. By MARION AMES TAGGART. *net*, 0 35
BEZALEEL. A Christmas Story. By MARION AMES TAGGART. *net*, 0 35
CIRCUS RIDER'S DAUGHTER, THE. A Novel. By F. v. BRACKEL. 1 25

CONNOR D'ARCY'S STRUGGLES. A Novel. By Mrs. W. M. Bertholds. 1 25

DION AND THE SIBYLS. A Classic Novel. By Miles Keon. Cloth, 1 25

FABIOLA; or, The Church of the Catacombs. By Cardinal Wiseman. Popular Illustrated Edition, 0.90; Edition de luxe, 5 00

FABIOLA'S SISTERS. A Companion Volume to Cardinal Wiseman's "Fabiola." By A. C. Clarke. 1 25

HEIRESS OF CRONENSTEIN, THE. By the Countess Hahn-Hahn. 1 25

IDOLS; or, The Secrets of the Rue Chausee d'Antin. De Navery. 1 25

LET NO MAN PUT ASUNDER. A Novel. By Josephine Marié. 1 00

LINKED LIVES. A Novel. By Lady Gertrude Douglas. 1 50

MARCELLA GRACE. A Novel. By Rosa Mulholland. Illustrated Edition. 1 25

MISS ERIN. A Novel. By M. E. Francis. 1 25

MONK'S PARDON, THE. A Historical Novel of the Time of Phillip IV. of Spain. By Raoul de Navery. 1 25

MR. BILLY BUTTONS. A Novel. By Walter Lecky. 1 25

OUTLAW OF CAMARGUE, THE. A Novel. By A. de Lamothe. 1 25

PASSING SHADOWS. A Novel. By Anthony Yorke. 1 25

PERE MONNIER'S WARD. A Novel. By Walter Lecky. 1 25

PETRONILLA. By E. C. Donnelly. 1 00

PRODIGAL'S DAUGHTER, THE. By Lelia Hardin Bugg. 1 00

ROMANCE OF A PLAYWRIGHT. By Vte. Henri de Bornier. 1 00

ROUND TABLE OF THE REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN CATHOLIC NOVELISTS. Complete Stories, with Biographies, Portraits, etc. Cloth, 1 50

ROUND TABLE OF THE REPRESENTATIVE FRENCH CATHOLIC NOVELISTS. Complete Stories, with Biographies, Portraits, etc. Cloth, 1 50

ROUND TABLE OF THE REPRESENTATIVE IRISH AND ENGLISH CATHOLIC NOVELISTS. Complete Stories, Biographies, Portraits, etc. Cloth, 1 50

TRUE STORY OF MASTER GERARD, THE. By Anna T. Sadlier. 1 25

VOCATION OF EDWARD CONWAY. A Novel. By Maurice F. Egan. 1 25

WOMAN OF FORTUNE, A. By Christian Reid. 1 25

WORLD WELL LOST. By Esther Robertson. 0 75

LIVES AND HISTORIES.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF ST. IGNATIUS LOYOLA. Edited by J. F. X. O'Conor. Cloth, *net*, 1 25

BLESSED ONES OF 1888, THE. Bl. Clement Maria Hoffbauer, C.SS.R.; Bl. Louis Marie Grignon de Monfort; Bl. Brother Aegidius Mary of St. Joseph; Bl. Josephine Mary of St. Agnes. From the original by Eliza A. Donnelly. With Illustrations, 0 50

HISTORIOGRAPHIA ECCLESIASTICA quam Historiæ seriam Solidamque Operam Navantibus, Accomodavit Guil. Stang, D.D. *net*, 1 00

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. Brueck. 2 vols., *net*, 3 00

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By John Gilmary Shea, LL.D. 1 50

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND. By Wm. Cobbett. Cloth, *net*, 0.50; paper, *net*, 0 25

LETTERS OF ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. By Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.SS.R. Centenary Edition. 5 vols., each, *net*, 1 25

LIFE OF BLESSED MARGARET MARY. By Mgr. Bougaud, Bishop of Laval. *net*, 1 50

LIFE OF CHRIST. Illustrated. By Father M. v. Cochem. 1 25

LIFE OF FATHER CHARLES SIRE, of the Society of Jesus. By Rev. VITAL SIRE. *net*, 1 00

LIFE OF FATHER JOGUES, Missionary Priest of the Society of Jesus. By Father F. MARTIN, S.J. *net*, 0 75

LIFE OF FR. FRANCIS POILVACHE, C.SS.R. Paper, *net*, 0 20

LIFE OF MOTHER FONTBONNE, Foundress of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Lyons. By ABBE RIVAUX. Cloth, *net*, 1 25

LIFE OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. Cloth, *net*, 5 00

LIFE OF SISTER ANNE KATHERINE EMMERICH, of the Order of St. Augustine. By Rev. THOMAS WEGENER, O.S.A. *net*, 1 50

LIFE OF ST. ALOYSIUS GONZAGA. Edition de luxe. By Rev. Father VIRGIL CEPARI, S.J. *net*, 2 50

LIFE OF ST. ALOYSIUS GONZAGA, of the Society of Jesus. By Rev. J. F. X. O'CONOR, S.J. *net*, 0 75

LIFE OF ST. CATHARINE OF SIENNA. By EDWARD L. AYME, M.D. ||1 00

LIFE OF ST. CLARE OF MONTEFALCO. LOCKE, O.S.A. *net*, 0 75

LIFE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. Illustrated. By Rev. B. ROHNER, O.S.B. 1 25

LIFE OF THE VEN. MARY CRESCENTIA HOESS. By Rev. C. DEVMANN, O.S.F. *net*, 1 25

LITTLE LIVES OF SAINTS FOR CHILDREN. BERTHOLD. Ill. Cloth, 0 75

LOURDES: Its Inhabitants, Its Pilgrims, Its Miracles. By Rev. R. F. CLARKE, S.J. 0 75

NAMES THAT LIVE IN CATHOLIC HEARTS. By ANNA T. SADLIER. 1 00

OUR BIRTHDAY BOUQUET. By ELEANOR C. DONNELLY. 1 00

OUR LADY OF GOOD COUNSEL IN GENAZZANO. A History of that Ancient Sanctuary. By ANNE R. BENNETT-GLADSTONE. 0 75

OUTLINES OF JEWISH HISTORY, From Abraham to Our Lord. Rev. F. E. GIGOT, S.S. || *net*, 1 50

OUTLINES OF NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY. By Rev. F. E. GIGOT, S.S. Cloth, *net*, 1 50

PICTORIAL LIVES OF THE SAINTS. Cloth, 1.00; 25 copies, 17 50

REMINISCENCES OF RT. REV. EDGAR P. WADHAMS, D.D., First Bishop of Ogdensburg. By Rev. C. A. WALWORTH. || *net*, 1 00

ST. ANTHONY, THE SAINT OF THE WHOLE WORLD. Rev. THOMAS F. WARD. Cloth, 0 75

STORY OF THE DIVINE CHILD. By Very Rev. Dean A. A. LINGS. 0 75

VICTORIES OF THE MARTYRS. By St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. *net*, 125

VISIT TO EUROPE AND THE HOLY LAND. By Rev. H. FAIRBANKS. 1 50

WIDOWS AND CHARITY. Work of the Women of Calvary and Its Foundress. ABBE CHAFFANJON. Paper, || *net*, 0 50

WOMEN OF CATHOLICITY. By ANNA T. SADLIER. 1 00

THEOLOGY, LITURGY, SERMONS, SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY.

ABRIDGED SERMONS, for All Sundays of the Year. By St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. Centenary Edition. GRIMM, C.SS.R. *net*, 1 25

BAD CHRISTIAN, THE. By Rev. F. HUNOLT, S.J. Translated by Rev. J. ALLEN, D.D. 2 vols., *net*, 5 00

BLESSED SACRAMENT, SERMONS ON THE. Especially for the Forty Hours' Adoration. By Rev. J. B. SCHEURER, D.D. Edited by Rev. F. X. LASANCE. *net*, 1 50

BREVE COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE DOGMATICAE ET MORALIS una cum aliquibus Notionibus Theologiae Canonicae Liturgiae, Pastoralis et Mysticae, ac Philosophiae Christianae. BERTHIER, M.S. || *net*, 2 50

BUSINESS GUIDE FOR PRIESTS. Stang, D.D. *net*, 0 85

CANONICAL PROCEDURE IN DISCIPLINARY AND CRIMINAL CASES OF CLERICS. By Rev. F. Droste. *net*, 1 50

CHILDREN OF MARY, SERMONS FOR THE. From the Italian of Rev. F. Callerio. Edited by Rev. R. F. Clarke, S.J. *net*, 1 50

CHRISTIAN ANTHROPOLOGY. Sermons. By Rev. John Thein. *net*, 2 50

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY. A Treatise on the Human Soul. By Rev. J. T. Driscoll, S.T.L. *net*, 1 25

CHRISTIAN'S LAST END, THE. Sermons. By Rev. F. Hunolt, S.J. Translated by Rev. J. Allen, D.D. 2 vols., *net*, 5 00

CHRISTIAN'S MODEL, THE. Sermons. By Rev. F. Hunolt, S.J. Translated by Rev. J. Allen, D.D. 2 vols., *net*, 5 00

CHRISTIAN STATE OF LIFE, THE. Sermons. By Rev. F. Hunolt, S.J. Translated by Rev. J. Allen, D.D. *net*, 5 00

CHRIST IN TYPE AND PROPHECY. Rev. A. J. Maas, S.J., Professor of Oriental Languages in Woodstock College. 2 vols., *net*, 4 00

CHURCH ANNOUNCEMENT BOOK. *net*, 0 25

CHURCH TREASURER'S PEW. Collection and Receipt Book. *net*, 1 00

COMMENTARIUM IN FACULTATES APOSTOLICAS EPISCOPIS necnon Vicariis et Praefectis Apostolicis per Modum Formularum concedi solitas ad usum Venerabilis Cleri, imprimis Americani concinnatum ab Antonio Konings, C.SS.R. Editio quarto, recognita in pluribus emendata et aucta, curante Joseph Putzer, C.SS.R. *net*, 2 25

COMPENDIUM JURIS CANONICI, ad usum Cleri et Seminariorum hujus Regionis accommodatum. *net*, 2 00

COMPENDIUM SACRAE LITURGIAE JUXTA RITUM ROMANUM una cum Appendice de Jure Ecclesiastico Particulari in America Foederata Sept. vigente scripsit P. Innocentius Wapelhorst, O.S.F. Editio quinta emendatior. *net*, 2 50

CONFESSIONAL, THE. By the Right Rev. A. Roeggl, D.D. || *net*, 1 00

DATA OF MODERN ETHICS EXAMINED. Ming, S.J. *net*, 2 00

DE PHILOSOPHIA MORALI PRAELECTIONES quas in Collegio Georgiopolitano Soc. Jesu, Anno 1889-90 Habuit P. Nicolaus Russo. Editio altera. *net*, 2 00

ECCLESIASTICAL DICTIONARY. By Rev. John Thein. || *net*, 5 00

ELEMENTS OF ECCLESIASTICAL LAW. By Rev. S. B. Smith, D.D.

ECCLESIASTICAL PERSONS. *net*, 2 50

ECCLESIASTICAL PUNISHMENTS. *net*, 2 50

ECCLESIASTICAL TRIALS. *net*, 2 50

FUNERAL SERMONS. By Rev. Aug. Wirth, O.S.B. 2 vols., || *net*, 2 00

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURES. By Rev. Francis E. Gigot, S.S. Cloth, *net*, 2 00

GOD KNOWABLE AND KNOWN. By Rev. Maurice Ronayne, S.J. *net*, 1 25

GOOD CHRISTIAN, THE. By Rev. J. Allen, D.D. 2 vols., *net*, 5 00

HISTORY OF THE MASS AND ITS CEREMONIES IN THE EASTERN AND WESTERN CHURCH. By Rev. John O'Brien. *net*, 1 25

LAST THINGS, SERMONS ON THE FOUR. Hunolt. Translated by Rev. John Allen, D.D. 2 vols., *net*, 5 00

LENTEN SERMONS. Edited by Augustine Wirth, O.S.B. || *net*, 2 00

LIBER STATUS ANIMARUM; or, Parish Census Book. *Pocket Edition*, *net*, 0.25; half leather, *net*, 2 00

LITERARY, SCIENTIFIC, AND POLITICAL VIEWS OF ORESTES A. BROWNSON. By H. F. Brownson. *net*, 1 25

MARRIAGE PROCESS IN THE UNITED STATES. Smith. *net*, 2 50

MORAL PRINCIPLES AND MEDICAL PRACTICE, THE BASIS OF MEDICAL JURISPRUDENCE. By Rev. Charles Coppens, S.J., Professor of Medical Jurisprudence in the John A. Creighton Medical College, Omaha, Neb.; Author of Text-books in Metaphysics, Ethics, etc. *net*, 1 50

NATURAL LAW AND LEGAL PRACTICE. Holaind, S.J. *net*, 1 75

NATURAL THEOLOGY. By B. Boedder, S.J. *net*, 1 50

NEW AND OLD SERMONS. A Repertory of Catholic Pulpit Eloquence. Edited by Rev. Augustine Wirth, O.S.B. 8 vols., || *net*, 16 00

OFFICE OF TENEBRAE, THE. Transposed from the Gregorian Chant into Modern Notation. By Rev. J. A. McCallen, S.S. *net*, 0 50

OUR LORD, THE BLESSED VIRGIN, AND THE SAINTS, SERMONS ON. By Rev. Francis Hunolt, S.J. Translated by Rev. John Allen, D.D. 2 vols., *net*, 5 00

OUTLINES OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. By Rev. Sylvester Jos. Hunter, S.J. 3 vols., *net*, 4 50

OUTLINES OF NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY. Vigot. Cloth, *net*, 1 50

PASTORAL THEOLOGY. By Rev. Wm. Stang, D.D. *net*, 1 50

PENANCE, SERMONS ON. By Rev. Francis Hunolt, S.J. Translated by Rev. John Allen. 2 vols., *net*, 5 00

PENITENT CHRISTIAN, THE. Sermons. By Rev. F. Hunolt. Translated by Rev. John Allen, D.D. 2 vols., *net*, 5 00

PEW-RENT RECEIPT BOOK. *net*, 1 00

PRAXIS SYNODALIS. Manuale Synodi Diocesanae ac Provincialis Celebrandae. *net*, 0 60

PRIEST IN THE PULPIT, THE. A Manual of Homiletics and Catechetics. Rev. B. Luebermann. *net*, 1 50

PRINCIPLES OF ANTHROPOLOGY AND BIOLOGY. By Rev. T. Hughes, S.J. *net*, 0 75

REGISTRUM BAPTISMORUM. *net*, 3 50

REGISTRUM MATRIMONIORUM. *net*, 3 50

RITUALE COMPENDIOSUM seu Ordo Administrandi quaedam Sacramenta et alia Officia Ecclesiastica Rite Peragendi ex Rituali Romano, novissime edito desumptas. *net*, 0 75

ROSARY, SERMONS ON THE MOST HOLY. Frings. *net*, 1 00

SACRED HEART, SIX SERMONS ON DEVOTION TO THE. By Rev. Dr. E. Bierbaum. *net*, 0 60

SANCTUARY BOYS' ILLUSTRATED MANUAL. Embracing the Ceremonies of the Inferior Ministers at Low Mass, High Mass, Solemn High Mass, Vespers, Asperges, Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament and Absolution for the Dead. By Rev. J. A. McCallen, S.S. *net*, 0 50

SERMON MANUSCRIPT BOOK. *net*, 2 00

SERMONS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND CHIEF FESTIVALS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR. With Two Courses of Lenten Sermons and a Triduum for the Forty Hours. By Rev. J. Pottgeiser, S.J. 2 vols., *net*, 2 50

SERMONS ON THE CHRISTIAN VIRTUES. By Rev. F. Hunolt, S.J. Translated by Rev. John Allen. 2 vols., *net*, 5 00

SERMONS ON THE DIFFERENT STATES OF LIFE. By Rev. F. Hunolt, S.J. Translated by Rev. John Allen. 2 vols., *net*, 5 00

SERMONS ON THE SEVEN DEADLY SINS. By Rev. F. Hunolt, S.J. 2 vols. Translated by Rev. John Allen, D.D. *net*, 5 00

SHORT SERMONS. By Rev. F. Hunolt, S.J. 5 vols., 10 00

SHORT SERMONS FOR LOW MASSES. Schouppe, S.J. *net*, 1 25

SYNOPSIS THEOLOGIAE DOGMATICAE AD MENTEM S. THOMAE AQUINATIS, hodiernis moribus accommodata, auctore Ad. Tanquerey, S.S.:

1. THEOLOGIA FUNDAMENTALIS. Half morocco, *net*, 1 50
2. THEOLOGIA DOGMATICA SPECIALIS. 2 vols., half morocco, *net*, 3 00

THEOLOGIA MORALIS NOVISSIMI ECCLESIAE DOCTORIS ALPHONSI. In Compendium Redacta, et Usui Venerabilis Cleri American accomodata. Auctore Rev. A. Konings, C.SS.R. Editio septima, auctior et novis curis expolitior curante Henrico Kuper, C.SS.R. 2 vols., *net*, 4 00

TWO-EDGED SWORD. By Rev. Augustine Wirth, O.S.B. Paper, *net*, 0 25

VADE MECUM SACERDOTUM, continens Preces ante et post Missam, modum providendi infirmos, necnon multas Benedictionum Formulas. Cloth, *net*, 0.25; Morocco flexible, *net*, 0 50

WHAT CATHOLICS HAVE DONE FOR SCIENCE. With Sketches of the Great Catholic Scientists. By Rev. Martin S. Brennan. 1 00

MISCELLANEOUS.

A GENTLEMAN. By M. F. Egan, LL.D. 0 75

A LADY. Manners and Social Usages. By Lelia Hardin Bugg. 0 75

AIDS TO CORRECT AND EFFECTIVE ELOCUTION. With Selected Readings. By Eleanor O'Grady. 1 25

BONE RULES; or, Skeleton of English Grammar. By Rev. J. B. Tabb, A.M. 0 50

CANTATA CATHOLICA. By B. H. F. Hellebusch. || *net*, 2 00

CATECHISM OF FAMILIAR THINGS. Their History, and the Events which Led to Their Discovery. With a Short Explanation of Some of the Principal Natural Phenomena. 1 00

CATHOLIC HOME ANNUAL. Stories by Best Writers. 0 25

CORRECT THING FOR CATHOLICS, THE. By Lelia Hardin Bugg. 0 75

ELOCUTION CLASS. A Simplification of the Laws and Principles of Expression. By Eleanor O'Grady. *net*, 0 50

EVE OF THE REFORMATION, THE. An Historical Essay on the Religious, Literary, and Social Condition of Christendom, with Special Reference to Germany and England, from the Beginning of the Latter Half of the Fifteenth Century to the Outbreak of the Religious Revolt. By the Rev. Wm. Stang. Paper, || *net*, 0 25

GAMES OF CATHOLIC AMERICAN AUTHORS:

PICTORIAL GAME OF CATHOLIC AMERICAN AUTHORS.
Series A, *net*, 0 15
Series B, *net*, 0 15

GAMES OF QUOTATIONS FROM CATHOLIC AMERICAN AUTHORS.
Series I., *net*, 0 15
Series II., *net*, 0 15
Series III., *net*, 0 15

GUIDE FOR SACRISTANS and Others Having Charge of the Altar and Sanctuary. By a Member of an Altar Society. *net*, 0 75

HOW TO GET ON. By Rev. Bernard Feeney. 1 00

LITTLE FOLKS' ANNUAL. 0.05; per 100, 3 00

ON CHRISTIAN ART. By Edith Healy. 0 50

READING AND THE MIND, WITH SOMETHING TO READ. By J. F. X. O'Conor, S.J. || *net*, 0 50

READINGS AND RECITATIONS FOR JUNIORS. O'Grady. *net*, 0 50

SELECT RECITATIONS FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS AND ACADEMIES. By Eleanor O'Grady. 1 00

C/01/c

335
C 287
11224
CATHREIN, V.
AUTHOR
Socialism Exposed and Refuted
TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	ROOM NUMBER
	Custer	
	Zion	
	MAY 22 1987	

FEB 2
APR 12

11224